

THE
REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 3.—JULY, 1890.

I.

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE.

1805–1872.

BY REV. WILLIAM FREDERICK FABER.

"For being of that honest few
Who give the Fiend himself his due,
Should eighty thousand college councils
Thunder 'Anathema,' friend, at you ;

"Should all our churchmen foam in spite
At you, so careful of the right,
Yet one lay-hearth would give you welcome
(Take it and come) to the Isle of Wight."

THUS in 1854, in a charming poem too long to be reproduced here, wrote Alfred Tennyson to Frederick Denison Maurice. The poet-laureate, it is hardly necessary to say, has never been in the habit of unveiling his personal feelings or his private concerns to the world ; it means all the more, therefore, when we find him publicly paying this warm tribute of genuine friendship and unaffected admiration.

Those who have read the delightful biography of Charles Kingsley (and whoever has not, should !) will recall frequent references to Maurice. The marked deference with which that

great leader and man of genius addresses his "master" can be accounted for only on the ground of an intellectual and spiritual indebtedness. At the close of their life-long friendship, when the elder of the two had gone to his reward, Kingsley wrote these words: "The most beautiful human soul whom God has ever, in His great mercy, allowed me—most unworthy—to meet with upon this earth; the man who, of all men whom I have seen, approached nearest to my conception of St. John, the Apostle of Love."

And yet this man, of whom the great have spoken with such reverence, is comparatively little known, even among those whose education and calling should prepare them to appreciate and welcome such a life and such a work as his. Some one has said that the world knows nothing of its greatest benefactors. In the case of Maurice we have an example of that truth. "How little did we recognize him here! and how much, in spite of that want of recognition, did he effect for us!" exclaims Richard Holt Hutton. And Hutton was one of his friends and frequent correspondents. Maurice himself understood, in a measure, that such was to be his lot; that he would be "little recognized," and that he was to "effect much." At the age of thirty-four he writes to a friend about some recent lectures of his, and the utterance is the more remarkable when we consider the singular humility that characterized him: "I look to my books dying after a few years, perhaps a few months, not of violent popularity such as, of course, kills rapidly, but of more lingering, comparatively unnoticed existence. Still I have no doubt at all that they are to do something, and that something will go forth from them into other men which will not die, but will be a portion of the life of their minds, and will prepare them for receiving truths much more clearly and perfectly revealed. . . . If I have done this for anybody, it signifies not to me the least how soon all the words which conveyed the impression are forgotten; how soon they are regarded as poor and idle words. The thing I wish to do I have done"

And what is that thing which he wished to do, and which we feel he has done? That we may the better answer the question, let us first, briefly as possible, pass his life in review before us.

Frederick Denison Maurice was born August 29, 1805, at Normanstone, England. His father was a Unitarian clergyman; his mother and sisters, during Frederick's youth, abandoned the father's creed; but though they all reacted to a severe Calvinism, they were unable to unite on any one orthodox body to which to transfer their church relations. Individuality was strongly marked in the members of the family; it seemed impossible for any two of them to agree in religious opinions; yet their disagreement was far from sectarian bitterness. There is perceptible in all a certain elevated tone, conscientiousness, candor, intellectual strength. It is essentially that "Puritan temperament" which Maurice often says he feels within himself, that is evident in the way they approach all questions of faith and duty.

At eighteen Frederick left home to enter the University of Cambridge. There he fell in with many who later in life achieved distinction. "Before he left the University," we are told, "he found himself the acknowledged leader of the most remarkable body of men within it." He completed his undergraduate work; but, being still a Unitarian, he could not take his degree, subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England being required before graduation. This sacrifice of a University career out of adherence to principle greatly pleased his father, who was destined soon to the greater disappointment.

For, after several years of editorial work in London, he turned again to study, and entered Oxford. His views had changed. Painful as it was to him on account of the pain it would give those dear to him, he announced his intention of taking orders in the Church of England; he subscribed the Articles, was baptized, and in 1834 was ordained.

For eleven years—that is, up to 1846—Maurice was chap-

lain of Guy's Hospital in London. In 1840 he was appointed Professor of English Literature in King's College, and in 1846 Theological Professor at the same institution. In the latter year he became chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, thus coming in contact with many of the legal profession, as he had before with the medical. In 1853 he was removed from his Theological Professorship, for views of which we shall speak later. From 1866 until his death in April, 1872, he held the chair of Casuistry, Moral Theology and Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge.

In one sense of the word his life was uneventful. It was not marked by incidents or circumstances that would lend themselves to dramatic or picturesque narration; the two volumes of his *Life*, it has been well said, "must read like the story of a shadow in a dream to those who think there is no eternal world at all." It was not a career in which ecclesiastical distinctions or preferments figured; in that respect it was almost obscure. And yet the half-century which would cover his mature life will be recorded as a period hardly to be surpassed in importance by any of like length in the history of British or of universal Christianity; and his own place in that period and in its movement of religious thought will yet be recognized as hardly second to that of any other. In the fruitfulness of the forty years of his life and teaching there would be matter for many a noble and inspiring volume.

Maurice was, perhaps, more than anything else, a *teacher*, an *educator*. Beginning with lectures to medical students at Guy's Hospital, running on through all his life, whether he is writing, or preaching, or lecturing, in college halls or wherever else he may meet many or few, old or young, who desired to learn and to whom he might impart, whether with the Bible as text-book or with problems of economy as theme—always it is the work of teaching, diffusing light, quickening moral instincts, inspiring the minds of men "to seek the things above." To disseminate information was, to his mind, the smallest part of education. If we may use the words which have done service

so long, he was always and everywhere a teacher of "wisdom" rather than of "knowledge;" a teacher of eternal truth.

For such a man there was nothing unnatural in bringing illustrations of spiritual principles "from the beds of sick and ignorant old women," as he was once taunted with doing. How different was his Bible-class from the gatherings so common under that name! Here was a true teaching of the lessons of the Word; it brought to him those whom ordinarily clergymen and college professors never touch, and he elicited from them the frank statement of their difficulties and even their disbelief, so that he might not give mere perfunctory instruction. In his dealings with opinions as in his dealings with men, he was wont to penetrate through all the outward accidental differences, and discover the great fundamentals and the essential unities, relating whatever he observed to those eternal truths for which he had so wonderful a vision.

He did have a special sympathy for the poor, the unfortunate, the unlettered, the defeated, the afflicted; he was a true disciple of Him "who went about doing good," and whose "gospel was preached to the wretched." He had scant respect for a Christianity whose doctrines were elaborated in the study, apart from the stress of life's conflicts and sorrows, and humanity's needs; whose ministrations were adapted to the comfortable classes, and whose sole message to the poor and the oppressed was, to wait for another world.

From 1849 to 1852 there were deep disturbances in the industrial system. Maurice, Kingsley, Ludlow and others co-operating, the "Christian Socialism" movement was set on foot, and in 1850 the "Christian Socialist" was published. Maurice carried the burden of responsibility very largely; he was all the time behind the work, giving his counsel and preventing excesses in speech or in policy. He was virtually the founder of the Working Men's College, London, to which he gave so much of his time and labor; it was opened in 1855, and Mr. Ruskin, among others, assisted in giving instruction. He was also the originator of the movement out of which came

Queen's College. This institution was born in 1847, and, in the face of much opposition, scored a first great victory for the cause of the higher education of women. The Archbishop of Dublin said of it in 1854: "Though many have watered and tended the plant, the vital seed in which it was all wrapped up, and out of which every part of it was unfolded, was sown only by him." Maurice remained in connection with Queen's College (there, too, as in the larger part of his many activities, serving without pay) till 1853, when he resigned on account of the judgment upon him which cost him his chair at King's College. He feared that the young institution might suffer in the public estimation from his connection with it.

This is but a superficial, hurried sketch—a few hasty items from the record of a life which was all of this same high quality: self-forgetful, unwearying in service, speaking the truth in love. He wrote many books, and noble books, too; but it was the man behind the books that pressed home the message which he always felt his words inadequate to utter. "He writes," says Horace Scudder, "to get at the heart of things." And so the books were only a means to him, not an end. They might die, as he said; but something would go forth from them which would not die. Or, to put it differently, having led us to the heart of things, having brought us face to face with eternal verities, the guide might disappear from sight and fade from memory; his purpose had been accomplished.

Let us endeavor to set before ourselves some of the characteristic features of the teachings of Mr. Maurice.

Principal Tulloch, in his admirable "*Movements of Religious Thought in Britain during the Nineteenth Century*," states that, in order to understand Maurice at all, it is necessary to bear in mind the two fundamental principles which underlie all his writings: the first, *the divine constitution of man in Christ*, or, as Maurice himself was so fond of putting it, in the quaint phrase that stamps itself on the memory, *Christ the Head of every man*; the second, which no one with the slightest knowledge of his life could have difficulty in naming—*unity*.

These master principles, like everything that he taught, had grown into clear and strong convictions through his own experience. Nothing he spoke was by hearsay; that which he had seen and felt in his own inner life, that which had become a vital reality to him,—that he declared. We have seen how peculiar were the conditions in which his boyhood was placed. A religiously divided household; a painful, almost morbid conscientiousness; add to this the sorrow of the father over the defection of his family; the gloom of the mother, who, having become a stanch believer in Predestination, now conceived the notion that she herself was not one of the elect; the sisters, too, contributing their share of distraction; and there, in the midst, a boy who had never had a true boyhood, carrying all the while upon his mind the burden of the distractions of his elders, and his own problems, which he had to solve for himself: it was a strange environment and a strange atmosphere for the young life. Yet the very disadvantage of the situation proved afterward to be Maurice's great vantage-ground. He grew to manhood ere he had attained his own full, clear faith "in the Father, and the Son and the Holy Ghost;" but he had been all the years learning and maturing under the best Teacher, and the many-sidedness of his own teaching was possible only through the providential circumstance that from his boyhood he had been compelled to look at truth from different points of view.

And perhaps we might more properly say that the principle of *unity*—and *catholicity*—precedes that which Tulloch places first. "From his earliest years," Maurice testifies in later life, "he had been haunted by the desire for unity." Was there no settlement possible for these clashing differences? was there no way in which the truth dear to each individual might be conserved in some larger and deeper form of truth, so that every one might be yet more loyal to his own belief while no longer arrayed against any other conscientious truth—and God-loving soul? Was it impossible? He came most firmly to believe that it was not. And if there was such a way, what was it?

Systems of doctrine—in other words, religious opinions—whether correct or incorrect, he soon found could not be that finality in which seeking souls might rest, or by which divisions could be healed. It must not be supposed, however, that Maurice disparaged Theology or Creeds. He magnified both. By what critics have chosen to call his perverseness, his love of paradox, he exalted the Articles and the so-called "Athanasian" Creed in a manner incomprehensible to many; and gloried in Theology as the noblest of sciences, the foundation on which all other studies stand. None the less, it was not to Theology as a science that he made his teaching the most noteworthy contribution, nor will the effect of his own temper serve to strengthen the hold of the "Athanasian" symbol on thinking minds. Much as he disliked the word "religion," from the mode of its application in his (and our) day, it was for Religion rather than for Theology that he did most—Religion in a better sense, the living after the Spirit.

"Religion," however, was assuming strange forms. The old "Evangelicalism," once genuine and fervid, had spent its force and was living now, in self-complacent contemplation of its "soundness," chiefly on the piety of yesterday. And now, again at Oxford, there was a new force showing itself. John Henry Newman, a man of richest mental and spiritual endowment, with a varied culture, with gifts that commanded attention in the circles of the choicest minds at England's noblest seat of learning, was leading a new "religious" movement—whither he himself knew not then. Both these Oxford "religions" were to make common cause against the man who felt that both were a narrowing and a formalizing of the blessed Gospel and the Church of Jesus Christ; the notorious "Record," and Dr. Pusey, diametrically opposed in all else, were at one in *this*, that Mr. Maurice was to be unrelentingly antagonized as a dangerous teacher, perverting the truth and undermining faith. And Maurice's whole life was to witness those conflicts with the "religious world," as it called itself, to which he felt summoned in the name of the Living God, for Whom, as he felt,

men were substituting some scheme, some Pharisee device of their own.

And this, as we were saying, he more and more felt could not be the bond of unity; no human scheme, even if accepted and agreed upon, could really bring the spirits of men together. No scheme of doctrine could, label it "Evangelical" or label it what you will: human constructions, man's opinions they were, after all; and by no consensus of opinion could men obtain unity. Opinion failed to meet the deepest want in man. By opinion men could not be saved. They were saved *by God in Christ; in Christ, therefore*, must they find their true and only Centre of Unity—*God* will make them one, if they but will; nay, already He has made them one, if they would but accept the fact, and live their lives in the consciousness of it.

Such, in few words, was Maurice's reasoning, as we understand it. Repeated in the most varied forms and the most different connections, it was always the same principle: unity wrought by God, unity in Christ, unity by the Divine Spirit.

It is quite the fashion to reckon him as a great "Broad Church" leader. But since the publication of his *Life* there can be no good excuse for doing so. The name, like any and every party name, he most emphatically repudiated; of the school itself, so far as it seemed to rest on latitude of opinions and to glory in being liberal, he almost stood in horror. He was a Churchman, a Catholic; not, however, in the Anglican or Tractarian sense. Newman and his co-workers were moved by a laudable zeal for the quickening of the Church of England, for her redemption from the low and dead formalism of a quasi-civil institution, for the revival of ancient faith and devotion, for the recognition of the divineness and the perpetuity of the Holy Catholic Church and for the renewed consciousness of the throb of that same life in the English Church as a member of the body—"the Holy Church throughout the world." And Maurice in all these aspirations was at one with them. He, too, wished the Church restored to power and influence over

the nation ; but it became plainer and plainer that the Tractarians desired such a restoration, after all, only for exclusion, while he for inclusion ; they for repression, he for progress ; they, in order, in Newman's words, " to hurl back the aggressive force of modern intellect," and to silence with the tone of authority every question and doubt, he in order to satisfy men's soul-hunger, answer their questions and resolve their doubts ; they desired a single Fold, with walls unscalable and doors close-guarded, he a spiritual Home, which in the Church, he believed, had been provided for all mankind by the Father of all.

"The Father of all," we say. It brings us to Maurice's other great principle: Are men—all men—children of God, or are they not? Children of God,—even if they be not good or obedient children, even if they be not children at one with their Father, "ever with Him," choosing to be at home with Him and to submit to His guidance and training,—are they, nevertheless, in some final and real sense, the offspring of God? Are the feelings of God and the attitude of God toward mankind such as we should naturally attribute to the Perfect One, whose Fatherhood, too, must be perfect? Are the words of Christ, in the Sermon on the Mount and in the sublime Parable of the Prodigal Son, purely figurative, expressive only of a general Divine Benevolence, with the parental feature merely incidental in the illustration? Are men as men progeny of the Devil? Is their essential constitution in Christ or in Satan? Which?

Whether properly guarded and qualified or not, Maurice uttered it as his conviction that the essential constitution of men is in Christ ; that they are the children of God. Now this, too, is intimately connected with his own experience. His mother had regarded herself as lying under the wrath of a Holy Sovereign, and he had pointed her, with burning and melting words, to the Father of infinite compassion. The conviction grew in him with his growth, and waxed stronger with his strength. The sin of men he came increasingly to regard as their self-will and their unbelief, out of which, as a fruitful

source, developed all the works of darkness, all shame and infamy of vice and crime. This he regarded as their condemnation, that while they were sons, they were living as prodigals; and while the Perfect Son had come, declaring the Father, recovering for them their forfeited inheritance and inviting them to the full privileges of their sonship, they aggravated their guilt by spurning the offer or heeding it not. Let them now but come, and they will find the Father has been waiting—waiting to welcome, not a stranger, the offspring of an enemy, but his own long-lost child.

We have chosen to say this in our own words, feeling sure that in so doing we have given the substance of Maurice's reasoning. The truth is, his writings are so full of it, explicitly and implicitly, that one knows not whence to extract for clearest and most concise statement.

Holding such a view, there were two conceptions of the relations of men to God with which Maurice must come in collision. That these two conceptions embodied, each in distorted form, an important truth (as we believe), he was perhaps not careful enough to state. Be that as it may, we are stating his position, not defending it. If it cannot defend itself, no defence of ours can strengthen it.

When the "Evangelicals" insisted upon conversion as *making* us children of God, till which experience we not are children of God, but children of the Devil; when the Tractarians maintained precisely the same proposition, simply reading in the place of "conversion," "Holy Baptism," Maurice parted company with them. To him it seemed monstrous to defer the Divine interest and parental affection till the soul should have passed through a certain "experience," or the body should have received a certain sacrament; or, what comes to the same thing, that men should be left to go on ignorant of the existence of an all-embracing Love, and fearing to presume that such Love was for *them* as well as for a certain chosen few. "More and more," he writes in 1871, in a retrospective letter to his son, "I was led to ask myself what a gospel to mankind

must be." And then, speaking of the Broad Churchmen, who seemed to him to be resting on breadth of opinion rather than on God, he adds: "What message have they for the people who do not live upon opinions nor care for opinions? Are they children of God, or must they now and forever be children of the Devil? To me life is a burden unless I can find an answer."

The "Evangelical" scheme stakes everything ultimately upon the Invisible Church; the Tractarian, upon the Visible, maintained by Apostolic Succession. Maurice would perhaps be hardly understood by either party in an utterance like the following, in a letter to a friend, written in 1834: "I would wish to live and die for the assertion of this truth: That the Universal Church is just as much a reality as any particular nation is: that the latter can only be believed real as one believes in the former; that the Church is the witness for the true constitution of man as man, a child of God, an heir of heaven, and taking up his freedom by baptism; that the world is a miserable, accursed, rebellious order, which denies this foundation, which will create a foundation of self-will, choice, taste, opinion; that in the world there can be no communion; that in the Church there can be universal communion—communion in one body by one Spirit." To words like these it may reasonably be objected that they presume definitions which would not describe actualities, but only ideals. But must not the same be said of St. John's entire First Epistle? And, as Kingsley so beautifully said, Maurice's spirit and temper were Johannine.

The passage serves to show sufficiently whither all his thoughts and efforts for unity were constantly tending. If more were needed, we might turn to the fifteenth of his *Theological Essays*, "On the Unity of the Church." "The World," he there says, "contains the elements of which the Church is composed. In the Church these elements are penetrated by a uniting, reconciling power. The Church is, therefore, human society in its normal state; the World, that same society irreg-

ular and abnormal. The world is the Church without God; the Church is the world restored to its relation with God, taken back by Him into the state for which He created it. Deprive the Church of its Centre, and you make it into a world. If you give it a false centre, as the Romanists have done, still preserving the sacraments, forms, creeds, which speak of the true Centre, there necessarily comes out that grotesque hybrid which we witness,—a world assuming all the dignity and authority of a Church—a Church practicing all the worst fictions of a world; the world assuming to be heavenly,—a Church confessing itself to be of the earth, earthly." And so he comes, in the conclusion, "to the root of all your [the Unitarians'] denials," "to that Name which *I* believe to be the ground of human life and of human society,"—and adds: "Will you listen while I tell you why I could not believe that a Trinity in Unity is a foundation for myself to rest upon, if I did not also regard it as a foundation for you and for all men?"

It will appear, therefore, how at bottom even the two fundamental principles, to which Tulloch refers all of Maurice's teachings, are further reducible to a single one. GOD, NOT MAN, was the message he was ever bringing to his readers and his hearers; human devices, human systems, human choices and club-affiliations he was ever repudiating,—in fact, everything that sought to satisfy man with aught except God. "Belief in God," instead of a "Religion about God," was the end he labored for. His most truly was a soul filled with the consciousness of God,—therefore filled also with indignation and horror at the evil and the falsehood he saw in men, in the "religious world," in himself; for he saw what those about him could not see, the roots of evil deep within, and he never spared himself in the accusations and confessions with which his pages abound. "Cry aloud, spare not," was, indeed, not his only word; but it ever accompanied his "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people."

To be set for the preaching of so large and so direct a mes-

sage was enough to "write upon his forehead not peace, but a sword." There were, however, two controversies in which Maurice figured, upon which we feel compelled to dwell more specially.

One was that with Dean Mansel, whose Bampton Lectures in 1858 on "The Limits of Religious Thought" took the philosophical position that God was essentially the Unknown and the Unknowable, and that Revelation was the Divine impartation of certain regulative hints to man, certain authoritative dogmas not addressed to the reason at all, but to be unquestioningly accepted, and that this acceptance was faith. This was Agnosticism, with an external appendage of Christian doctrine. Keener minds readily cut off the appendage, and the historical fact is that the Agnostics of to-day trace the inception of their present movement to this utterance of a Church of England clergyman.

Frederick Maurice could not keep silence. "He believed that in the Divine Perfection of the Son all things were made; that that perfection was one with the eternal nature of the Father, and found its perfect expression or incarnation in the man Christ Jesus." "The eternal had so manifested itself in the flesh, that utterly inconceivable as the Divine nature would have been without such a manifestation, yet, since it has been made, we may be sure that, search where we may through all that eternity may contain, there can be in the Infinite Nature no variableness or shadow of turning from the character which Christ revealed in a man. Mr. Mansel held any such knowledge of God absurd, a vain conceit on the part of man. The importance of the Bampton lectureship as a means of instructing the future religious instructors of the people necessitated a reply. Maurice wrote to answer, in his way, the question, "What is Revelation?" and the ensuing controversy is considered by so philosophical an historian as Dr. Alexander Allen "perhaps the most significant one in the whole history of the Church since Athanasius stood up to resist the Arians on a similar, if not the same identical issue."

Five years before this time he had lost his chair of Theology at King's College through the clamor ensuing upon the publication of his *Theological Essays*. The chief point at issue was as to the meaning of the word "eternal." The current notions made it a mere synonym of "endless." Maurice insisted that such an interpretation emptied the expressions "eternal life," "eternal punishment," and the like, of their true moral and spiritual content. He insisted that the "eternal life" of which St. John speaks is something very different from a "future existence of limitless duration;" that it signifies the fulness and power of the positive Divine life, "the righteousness and truth and love of God which are manifested in Christ Jesus"—that as death is the loss, the cessation, the forfeiture of life, so "eternal death" is the forfeiture of that knowledge of God and presence of God; and "eternal punishment" is the "separation from the Eternal God," "the misery of being left alone with themselves."

The Essay was a tremendous arraignment. "If we believe that the words Eternal Damnation or Death had a very terrible significance, such as the Bible tells us they have, is it nothing that they should be losing all their significance for our countrymen? Is it nothing that they should seem to them mere idle nursery-words that frighten children, but with which men have nothing to do? Is it nothing that a vague dream of bliss hereafter, into which righteousness and goodness do not enter, which has no relation to God, should float before the minds of numbers; but that it should have just as little power to awaken them to any higher or better life as the dread of the future has to keep them from any evil?"

This was not an erratic diversion from the straight path. Much less was it a mere matter of correct exegesis and proper translations—though into these points, so far as necessary, the Essay also entered, and very effectively, too. No, it was the necessary outcome of Maurice's doctrine of God as all in all, morally, spiritually. This is the positive principle running through his whole discussion. "Whenever the word *Eternal* is

used in the New Testament, it ought first, by all rules of reason, to be considered *in reference to God.*" There is the clue. If in Christ God is revealed; if in that revelation the Eternal Life is come into the world; if the New Testament Scriptures give us the record of that Person, of His deeds and of His Kingdom; then that ever-recurring word *Eternal* must in its positive sense express that which God, as we know Him in Christ alone can fully be. "Eternal Life," "Eternal Death"—endless they either or both may be, perhaps must be: but this is not at all the heart of the matter, much less the whole of it. To make it so is to make another Gospel, which is no gospel at all.

In conclusion, a word about the "vagueness" and "looseness" of Maurice.

For one thing, Maurice was not a literary master. He wrote with fervor—with large intermixture of the personal elements of self-accusation and confession, of abhorrence, of enthusiasm—not in the calm, clear, lucid, pointed, passionless style of a Matthew Arnold. He was often totally misunderstood, and then would deplore it as his guilt, which yet he knew not how to remedy. But was it not so with St. Paul? Was not his style involved; were not his expressions often awkward—often obscure—charged with personal elements that served to confuse his main thought; yet fervid, eloquent, humble, sublime, uttering, though in words hard to be understood, the mind of the Spirit?

"Vague" Maurice was; he did lack definiteness, partly by reason of defects of style; but more, by reason of the nature of the things he saw, which the unspiritual could not see; by reason of the largeness, the depth, the intensity of his convictions as to eternal things, for which the poor currency of our earthy speech was oftentimes quite too inadequate. St. John lacks, in such a sense, the definiteness, the concreteness that certain kinds of men prize above all else; was he, in any culpable sense, "vague?"

For we will not grant that common, flippant accusation

which calls Maurice's views "loose." How could any man more utterly reprobate sin in every form and guise, more glorify God, more exalt Christ, more emphatically preach that "in us—that is, in our flesh—dwelleth no good thing?" That in the heat of the controversy such things should have been said—and believed—as that his writings made thousands of infidels, that "he denied retribution," and the like, *ad nauseam*, is perhaps not to be wondered at, considering the extraordinary powers of the "religious" imagination in a time of fancied "perils." If memory serves us, the monks said of Luther, among ten thousand other things, that "he had made up the book which he called the New Testament, himself." Our Blessed Lord was to the Pharisees a Sabbath-breaker, a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, and a blasphemer.

No man could more emphatically disavow the desire of starting a party or school, originating a "new Theology," or minimizing the Faith for the benefit of skeptics and disbelievers. He verily believed that this which he preached and taught was that ancient Catholic Faith, "once for all delivered to the saints," even as he loved to utter it in the words of the venerable ecumenical Creeds; that all his writing and speaking was only in exposition of *that*, not to the intellects, but to the hearts and consciences of men, the one blessed immutable Gospel of God to the world.

And we agree with Principal Tulloch in holding that the work of Maurice was primarily apologetic. In a better than the vulgar sense, he was set "for the defense and confirmation of faith." Or, as Horace Scudder has put it, he was a prophet. His statements must not be taken like sentences out of a body of Systematic Divinity. Theology as a science, as we have said before, was not the end he had in view. To him the things in the Creed were *facts*; he felt it his mission to make men actually believe, and ground their whole thinking and living upon those facts, and to press them home *everywhere*, too, for if they were not mere school propositions, if they were actually true, they must be true everywhere. The industrial world,

the social classes and the masses—all the callings of men—all the institutions of mankind—all must be redeemed by the same Power, all must be made true to the Divine intent of their constitution by being Christianized, by being claimed for Christ and conformed to their ground-principle in God. And so, while all his life was a teaching, all his teaching was more than teaching—it was a *deed*. Looking back upon his finished career, we can but repeat of him, humblest of men, the words which Gladstone applied to him when the two were fellow-students at Oxford: "A spiritual grandeur."

II.

THE GOD-MAN.

*THE DIVINE AND THE HUMAN NATURES IN CHRIST DISCUSSED
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO NESTORIAN AND
EUTYCHIAN CONTROVERSIES.*

BY REV. O. J. ACCOLA, D.D.

Second Article.

THE beginning of the controversy about the relations of the divine and human natures in Christ dates from Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea, near the middle of the fourth century. According to his conception of man as a trychotomy, consisting of body, soul and spirit, he taught that the Logos had assumed a human body and animal soul, but not the self-conscious spirit (*σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴ ἄλογος*, but not the *νοῦς* or *πνεῦμα*). The place of the human spirit was taken by the *Λόγος*. His argument was that the Logos, or a perfect God and a perfect man, cannot enter into so close a union as to constitute one person; two knowing, understanding and willing beings cannot form one and be one being. His reasoning was certainly logical, but he started from a wrong presupposition, as most of the fathers did, as we shall see hereafter. Athanasius and others wrote against him, and at several provincial synods his doctrine was rejected. In opposition to his doctrine it was affirmed that the Son of God had assumed a perfect human nature, having body and a reasonable soul, which is the same as to say that the Son united himself to a human individual. This doctrine does not differ essentially from the later (by the Church condemned) Nestorianism, only that the union of the divine and human natures was

by Nestorianism held to be more intimate. In regard to the relation of the two natures no definite decision had yet been given. We find however among the leading men of that age two different tendencies prevailing; in each was expressed some truth, but in neither the whole and pure truth.

The main representatives were the two schools above named, and their followers. The Alexandrians laid special stress on the close and inseparable union of the two natures, and accused their opponents with holding the human and the divine so far apart as to dissolve the unity. But according to the Alexandrians, the human vanishes and is almost lost in the divine; there was a very short step between their view and the later *Communicatio idiomatum*. The truth of the incarnation was lost in expressions like this: God is born of the virgin Mary. The monks (who were as a rule very ignorant) and the common people could not discern the significance of subtle technical terms; no doubt they meant to honor Christ when they called Mary the mother of God; but wrong expressions generally denote wrong ideas.

The followers of the Antiochian school and the Syrians in general guarded against a mixture of the two natures and the absorption of the human by the divine; they laid main stress upon the full integrity and independence of each nature. By doing so, they fell into the opposite error, the *separation* of the natures and the recognition of only a mechanical union; the divine and the human were put in a kind of juxtaposition. They were therefore accused (what was however denied by them) of teaching not only two *natures* in Christ, but two *persons*.

The external occasion of the quarrel which soon broke out and in which the whole Church took more or less part, was the expression: *Maria Θεοτόκος*. Now this phrase, literally understood, is a contradiction in itself, and hence unmeaning. Properly understood it may be admissible, but at any rate, it is better not to use it, as it gives occasion for misapprehension and abuse. It is true, the Logos was conceived in the womb of the Virgin; through her He became incarnate and was born,

but not born as the Son of God, but as the *Son of Man*. But there was more implied than the mere name suggests: otherwise *θεοτόκος*, upon which term one party laid so great weight that it would not give up its use, and which was to the other party so offensive, could not have become the Shibboleth between the parties. Ideas exist before their respective designations.

Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, preached a number of sermons against the above-mentioned title, which, with special predilection, the Alexandrians applied to the mother of our Lord. He pronounced it to be improper, idolatrous and against the honor of God. Not *God*, but the *man assumed* by him has a mother, the Logos passed through her. Not God has suffered. "The life-giving Godhead they call mortal and venture to drag the Logos down upon a level with the fables of the theatre, as if he had been wrapped up in swaddling clothes and had died." It is difficult fully to grasp the idea of Nestorius and get a clear understanding of his teaching, for conclusions were drawn already by his contemporaries, which he did not admit; and opinions about his true meaning differ. Essentially it was this: The incarnation consisted herein, that the Son of God, the Logos, united himself in the womb of the virgin Mary with a full and self-existing human nature (in concreto). He does not, however, call this being a *personality*. The divine and human nature are so united, or rather put together or combined, that neither nature is influenced by the other. Each nature in the one Christ acts and suffers in its part independently of the other. Each remains in its integrity. We have in Christ a man united with God, or the reverse. Accordingly, it cannot be said, Mary has borne the Son of God, but only, she bore a man who by union with God became the Son of God; or, the Son of God came forth from the virgin when Christ was born. In his eagerness to avoid the least conception of any mixture of the two natures, he separated them so far, that the true and living union was lost. Yet he would not be understood as if he were teaching two sons, a Son of man and a Son of God, in the one Christ. After the assumption of the human nature he

said, the Logos must not be called Son independently and separated from the human nature, else we should have two sons.

The consequences to which his system must very naturally lead, and which were soon seen by others, he himself most probably did not anticipate. He only wanted to exclude every kind of mingling or mixture of the natures; both, without any alteration as to completeness and substantiality, were always to be recognized in the one Saviour. Such a union as the Alexandrians taught he could not conceive of without mixture. Further, he did not distinguish sharply enough between nature and person, *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*. These words were sometimes used synonymously, and this caused misconception and confusion.

Nestorius, as we have remarked above, was neither the first nor the only one who held and taught this doctrine. Theodore of Mopsuestia and others had substantially expressed the same views. In opposition to the Alexandrian theologians, who taught a communication of the divine attributes to the human nature, they held that even a *free human will* must be ascribed to the human nature in Christ. But, though each nature is distinctively itself after the union, yet there is only *one* person. There are not two sons, but there is only one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, with whom the man Jesus is united and partakes of the Godhead of the Son.

The sermons which Nestorius preached against the epithet, *Μαρία Θεοτόκος*, caused general dissatisfaction and great disturbance. He was even interrupted in his preaching and accused of tearing Christ asunder. Among all the bishops it was especially Cyril of Alexandria who felt it his duty to rise up against Nestorius. Whether true zeal for orthodoxy, or partly a natural disposition to quarrel, or jealousy on account of his opponent's high position and fame as an orator, of which some accuse him, may have incited him, must remain undecided. It is further not certain how far Cyril himself had clear insight into the matter under dispute, for he expressed himself differently at different times. He wrote twelve anathemas against

Nestorius, to which Nestorius responded with twelve counter-anathemas.

In this connection it is in place to consider Cyril's doctrine. In church histories he is generally pointed out as one of the pillars of orthodoxy. This honor we must deny him, though we do not deny that he did the Church good service. By some he is regarded as a man of haughty and quarrelsome disposition. His enemies may have somewhat exaggerated his faults. Be this as it may, we have not now to do with his character, but with his doctrine. He taught rightly such a union of the two natures in Christ, that the *oneness* of the *person* was preserved; that two self-conscious beings, two *egos*, were absolutely excluded. He deserves credit for pointing to the fact, which Athanasius also had done, that the *Logos* not only had *assumed* a human nature, but that He had Himself *become* man, had identified Himself with humanity. At the same time he refutes the notion of a mixture of the two natures and of a transmutation of the one into the other. If he had stopped here or built his system consistently upon this true principle, he might have attained to the full truth. But he also diverged; in his further expositions he swerved from his proper and scriptural views to the opposite extreme of the Nestorian doctrine. So he contradicted himself, as, however, others in this controversy also had done. He sees in Christ not only one *person*, but even *one nature*; he so blends the attributes peculiar to each nature that the Godhead and divine perfections were transferred to the human nature. This did not at all sound orthodox, and it was not, or if, in the judgment of any denomination, it is deemed orthodox, it was not scriptural. Cyril's doctrine contained the germ, if not more, of the later Eutychianism. In his zeal he, like others, was driven to false extremes.

Both Cyril and Nestorius appealed to the bishop of Rome, who was already practically looked upon as the head of the Church. Cælestine decided, as might have been expected, in favor of Cyril, who no doubt was nearer the truth, and de-

manded of Nestorius to recede from his error. This he refused to do. In 431 a council was held at Ephesus, where the teaching of Nestorius was condemned as heresy, he himself deposed from office, and the anathema of the Church was pronounced upon him. With these proceedings, however, not all the fathers were agreed, and the strife continued. Under the influence and at the command of the Emperor Theodosius II., a formula of peace was fabricated, to which it was thought all parties should agree. Some concessions were made to the Alexandrians, some to the Antiochians. In this formula are distinguished *two natures* in the *one* Christ. The use of the term *θεοτόκος* is permitted. The attributes ascribed to the Saviour may be applied either to the person of Christ without distinction of natures or to the one or the other nature. The object of the Emperor was good. He desired peace, without which the Church can never prosper, and he wanted to promote peace by authority. But, as might have been expected, he did not succeed. An emperor may make laws for his people; but when he undertakes to dictate peace and unity of faith, it must prove a failure. The less he interferes in questions of doctrine, the better it is. Most probably, Theodosius himself understood very little of the whole matter, and stood, in this case, under the influence and direction of his theologians. The creed thus formed could not satisfy any party for any length of time. It was not direct, precise and positive enough; the differences of the ideas of contending parties were more or less concealed, but were not removed. Although Cyril himself and the other fathers at the council—many to please the Emperor, not from conviction—gave their names and assent to the new formula, yet the peace was of short duration. While for a few years peace was preserved outwardly, the fire of contention was glowing under the ashes, and was ready to break out into flames on any occasion. It was Cyril that stirred the fire and caused the outbreak of the quarrel.

In 433 he declared, in contradiction to the decision given at Ephesus, that the duality of the natures in Christ was to be

confined to the divine and human *attributes*, forgetting or overlooking that the difference of attributes was founded upon the difference of *nature per se*. He said after the incarnation there was only one incarnate nature of the Logos. This was very ambiguous, and could be construed in different ways. He could be understood as teaching that by the act of incarnation the one nature—the human—was translated into the divine or absorbed by it, or perhaps, with more truth, that both natures were so blended together and amalgamated that only one nature remained, but with divine and human attributes. Affirming two classes of attributes without the corresponding two natures is, of course, a contradiction. Many of the Egyptian bishops and monks understood him in the latter sense, and turned it to their advantage. But his opponents took his words in the same sense, and protested against his doctrine.

In place of the deposed Nestorius, Flavian ascended the patriarchal chair of Constantinople. Eutyches, archimandrite of a cloister in the neighborhood, now gave definite shape and form to the ideas which heretofore were expressed only occasionally. By him the germ was developed into a system. Like Nestorius, he was a pious man, and adhered faithfully to the Scriptures, but narrow-minded and of limited knowledge, shortsighted and intolerant, like the majority of his contemporaries. He was a monk, and his piety of a monkish character. We have no reason to doubt the sincerity of either of the two. They both preferred deposition and banishment; both suffered rough and cruel treatment, and bore the anathemas of the church rather than deny what they regarded as the truth. Though they were not orthodox, though their views were surely erroneous, yet their faithfulness and constancy deserve our esteem much more than the suppleness and pliability of those who, for the sake of office and honor, and for the favor of the multitude, sign creeds against conviction, may they be ever so orthodox.

Eutyches did not mean to differ materially from Cyril, who was regarded as orthodox. Let us now look into his system.

He went to the opposite extreme of Nestorius. Whilst, according to Nestorius, the union of the two individual natures in Christ was only mechanical, according to Eutyches the union was so close that it could not justly be called a union, because the human nature entirely lost its identity and integrity, and was wholly assimilated to the divine. His words are: "*Before the union there were two natures; after the union there was only one, that of the Logos.*" This is the same language which Cyril had used. What his notion was about this union it is difficult to state correctly. Either he conceived in his mind an ideal human being which became real for the purpose of forming a union with the Logos, or, which is essentially the same, that God prepared a human being in the womb of the virgin with which the Son of God became united. His meaning was not, however, as is sometimes wrongly imputed to him, that the nature of Christ was a mixture of the divine and human, being neither purely the one nor the other, but it was this: The human nature, or that human being with which the Logos entered into union, was identified with him, became deified, was absorbed and swallowed up by the Logos, and consequently ceased to exist as an integral part of Christ. The doctrine of Eutyches has great similarity to the later Lutheran doctrine of the *Communicatio idiomatum*. The divine attributes and perfections of the Logos are communicated to the man Jesus; thus his humanity was dissolved and consumed as wood is consumed by fire, and becomes, as it were, fire itself. The predecessors of Eutyches, holding his theory, to some extent, at least, to whom he could refer and appeal, were among the most illustrious men of the church; not only a Cyril, but an Athanasius, a Gregory of Nazianzen and others. Some of them, for instance, used the illustration of the red-hot iron. Gregory had compared the relation of the human nature to Christ to a drop of vinegar which is poured into the ocean and there disappears.

As in the case of Nestorius, now again both parties appealed to the Roman bishop. Leo of Rome rejected the teaching of Eutyches, and demanded his deposition. He did still more.

After he had received full information about the controversy and the proceedings of the provincial council, which had in the meantime (A. D. 448) been held at Constantinople when Eutyches was deposed, he wrote a doctrinal letter to Flavian, bishop of Constantinople, the so-called "*Epistola dogmatica ad Flavianum*," which is distinguished by its clearness and conciseness, and which has justly become renowned in the history of the ancient church. This epistle contains the best, fullest and clearest view of the mystery of incarnation which up to that time had been expressed by any one, and the enthusiasm with which it was heard and received at the next ecumenical council may easily be imagined. It became not only a fundamental part of the confession soon afterwards issued, but was itself, with few modifications, embodied in it.

With the deposition of Eutyches the victory of orthodoxy was not yet entirely gained; heterodoxy again obtained the ascendancy for a short season. Under the leadership of Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, successor to Cyril, the so-called "robber synod" was held at Ephesus A.D. 449; Eutyches was reinstated; Flavian was deposed, cruelly treated and banished. This triumph of heresy and open violence happily did not last long. Shortly after the episode at Ephesus the emperor Marcianus summoned an ecumenical council, to be held at Chalcedon in the year 451. This council was in regard to the number of attending bishops the largest, in regard to outward display the most glorious of all church assemblies, and in regard to importance it was not inferior to any. It had, indeed, a great work to perform. To restore the peace of the church, to unite opposing parties, and to bring the disturbed elements to rest by forming a creed on the person of Christ which should be the norm of faith for Christianity,—this was the main object. The confession which was drawn up by that venerable assembly alone concerns us at present. Leo's epistle *ad Flavianum* and the twelve anathemas of Cyril against Nestorius were the basis of this new creed, the sum and substance of which is the following:

The one Son of God, Jesus Christ, is perfect in His divinity and perfect in His humanity; truly God and truly man, consisting of a reasonable soul (against Apollinarius) and a human body; of the same essence with the Father as to His divinity, and of the same essence with us as to His humanity, like (*ὁμοούσιος*) unto us in every respect, with the exception of sin. The two natures exist in Him without mixture and transformation, also without division or separation. The distinction of natures is not abolished by the union, but to each remain its peculiar properties and attributes unchanged; both natures subsist in the one person and mode of being. There are not two sons separated into two persons, but it is the one and the same Son, the only begotten from the Father, our Lord Jesus Christ.

This confession has become, and at least in theory and in its main tenets has remained, the creed of the orthodox church, the Roman Catholic and Protestant as well. We mean, of course, specially the theological portion of the Church, for the people know hardly anything even of the existence of this creed. Most of the fathers subscribed their names to it, whether from real conviction or from other motives it is not for us to judge. Neither is it our purpose to criticise it. With this result the long controversies on the person of Christ were in the main ended, and the church was at rest. The later monophysitic and monotheletic controversies were but a few flashes of lightning after the storm, which did not agitate the church at large. Nestorianism and Eutychianism were alike rejected. The church had reason to rejoice over the victory. Though heresy had not died out altogether, for small fractions of both excluded parties still remained and have existed up to the present day; but they have always been regarded as sects, and have had very little or no influence upon the further development of church-doctrines.

After this historical outline of the christological controversy, we proceed to the third part of our essay, which will be a critical review of, and some explanatory remarks upon the subject in question.

1. The church had a perfect right and duty to watch over the *pure faith* as well as the life of her members, especially of those who were called to be spiritual teachers and leaders of whole congregations; she had therefore also a right to reject and condemn the doctrines of Nestorius and of Eutyches, and even to depose them from office; but the *manner* in which the church did this, and the treatment these men and their adherents received, can in no wise be justified, neither by our modern standard of tolerance, nor by Scripture, which admonishes us to bear with an erring brother and to restore him in the spirit of meekness. This rule was too often forgotten on both sides. The weapons of the warfare waged by those Christians were not always spiritual, but frequently very carnal. It was a rude age in which they lived, an age full of excitement and irritation; fanaticism was too easily taken for pious zeal; and by hard measures, even by violence, they meant so serve God.

On the other hand, we must consider that truth is a precious thing, and as a rule it can neither be gained nor preserved without struggles and contentions. Sometimes it is even necessary to cut an otherwise useful member from the body, in order to keep the body sound. It should also be remembered, that in contending for the truth we are all liable to err; that the convictions even of an opponent must be regarded, and finally that each one will have to give an account for himself; self-recollection will save us from being too harsh and severe, and too quick in pronouncing anathemas.

Those controversies were not, what some have tried to make them, a mere dispute about words; fundamental truths were involved. Both Nestorianism and Eutychianism consistently carried out affect materially the work of redemption, and shake the foundation of our hopes; because in neither system is a full and true incarnation of Christ recognized. According to Nestorius, we have only the union of the Logos with a man or a human individual; the Logos himself has not become one with humanity; he is no real member of our race; there is no true, living and direct connection between him and our nature.

His work, humiliation, suffering and death loses its infinite value, as it is rather the *man* Jesus who suffered, whilst the Logos had no direct part in it. According to Eutyches, God did not become man, but a man, through the agency of the Logos, became God. Instead of speaking of an incarnation of the Son of God, it would be more consistent, proper and true to speak of a deification of man, or rather of a man. If Eutyches' ideas were correct Christ was not truly human; He never had any real human wants, feelings or sympathies. His temptations and trials, His victory over sin, His obedience unto death, all this has no moral significance for us, and He can therefore neither be an example for us, nor a comfort to us in our trials. He does not, and never did, know anything of the condition of a poor, weak human creature from His own personal experience. Then He is not that High Priest who, not because He is a merciful God, but because *He was tempted like ourselves*, can have pity upon us.

In this connection, we shall in a few words touch a point, which is another mystery in His person, and which, we are aware, may call forth objections. Does not this Person, capable of being tempted like ourselves, imply the *possibility* of sin? Wherefore would the Scriptures lay so much weight upon Christ's innocency, on His temptations and obedience? how could they direct our attention to these facts accompanied with the exhortation, that we herein find comfort and encouragement and take Him as our example, if the *possibility* of sin on His part is entirely excluded? If Adam had been in a condition of "*non posse peccare*" his temptation would have been a mock-temptation. Is this different with the second Adam? If we make full earnest with His true humanity, we have a right to exclude from Him all *actual* sin and a *sin-stained condition*, but we must admit the *possibility* of sinning. His humanity was like that of our first Adam before the fall. Further, if Christ possessed all the divine attributes in His state of humiliation, if he was omniscient in embryo and was governing the world while hanging on the cross, then all that the Bible tells of His

gradual development, His growing in the spirit is mere sham. Eutychianism leads naturally and necessarily either to patripassianism or docetism.

2. If we inquire, how it was possible that Christians of that age could be engaged in such bitter and passionate controversies for so many centuries, two answers may be given, besides what has been hinted already. The Church was not only anxious to preserve the unity of faith, which was right and proper, but she wanted also *uniformity of theological views and expressions*. This, however, under existing circumstances, and in regard to such mysterious and unsearchable matters, is impossible, although it may be deemed to be ever so desirable.

Another fact is also of great importance. Technical theological terminology was not yet fully established. The contending fathers were not always clear in their conceptions, neither did they always fully understand the meaning of the terms they did use; hence they contradicted themselves sometimes without knowing it, in the attempt to avoid Nestorianism, some bordered on Eutychianism; attempting to avoid this, the other bordered on Nestorianism. Words of different meaning were often used synonymously; again, one person used the same word in one sense, whilst another used it in another sense. For instance, the word *ἐκδοσις* was used for *οὐσία* or *φύσις*, and *vice versa*. Even the word *πρόσωπον*, person, did not necessarily imply a self-conscious ego. So if one used the word *natura* or *φύσις* in the abstract, and another used it in the concrete, the conception was different. This uncertainty and unsettled use of theological terms caused naturally much misunderstanding and confusion. Theologians were tinged with philosophical ideas, without being real philosophers, though some few of them were deep and sharp thinkers; the majority, however, no doubt pious, but narrow-minded, intolerant children of their age, with only superficial learning, could hardly avoid misconceptions and self-contradictions; hence arose controversies when they entered into the field of theological speculation.

3. At the bottom of all false notions about the divine-human constitution of Christ, and the main cause of confusion, was a false pre-supposition. The root was not sound, and in consequence that which grew out of it could not be sound. To draw correct conclusions the premise must be correct. The false principle, from which both Nestorius and Eutyches started out and upon which they built their systems, was the idea that the Son of God *united Himself with or took upon Him a human nature*, in concreto, or rather a human individual. In fact, most of the men connected with that controversy cherished this fundamentally wrong idea; only a few of them occasionally hinted at the true principle. Those orthodox bishops who maintained against Apollinaris that the Logos assumed a whole human nature, consisting of body, soul and spirit, or reasonable soul, held to the same false principle, and contradicted themselves, asserting and denying the same thing at the same time. They asserted a *reasonable human soul*, yet denied human *personality*. We can conceive of human attributes in abstracto, but we cannot conceive of a human body, soul and spirit in abstracto, as the spirit or reasonable soul is the very person-forming *principle* in man. Even the confession of Chalcedon is not altogether free from this false root-idea. It appeared again in the monotheletic controversy, when the Church declared that there were *two wills* (*θηλέματα*) in Christ. In spite of the acknowledged orthodoxy of duothelematism we say that it pre-supposes a twofold personality, for only a *person* can have a *will*, in the proper sense of the word. There were not two *will*s in Christ; but two different *modes of energy*, or two energies (*ἐνέργειαι*)—divine and human—must be ascribed to Him.

From the standpoint which Nestorius and Eutyches had taken, they could only arrive at either the one or the other of the conclusions at which they did arrive, or at a third conclusion, namely, a mixture of natures, a being neither divine nor human. Both agreed on the first axiom; both said *before* the union there were *two* natures. Then they separated, and, as we have seen,

arrived at opposite poles. The true axiom would have been: before the union (better, before the incarnation) there was in the Mediator only *one* nature—that of the divine Logos; from this principle at the foundation of Christology it would at least have been possible to build up a system of truth.

4. In the whole Scripture we find it nowhere taught that the Son of God *took upon Him* or *assumed* a human nature, or *united* himself with a human nature, much less a human individual, personal or impersonal, but He, *He Himself became man*; *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*. The Word was made flesh. God manifested Himself in the flesh. Here is the key to the solution of the Christological question under consideration. Could we comprehend the mystery of the incarnation, then the whole divine-human life and work of Christ would be explained to us.

Only as He Himself the Logos *became* man, He became, in truth, one of us, a link in the chain of humanity, and at the same time its centre. He is Himself the Seed of David, the Son of man, not a human individual united with Him. In *this* sense only may it be said that He took upon Him human nature in abstracto, or humanity, as He entered into the sphere of human life and partook of that which belongs essentially to human nature in its normal state. But after His incarnation, as well as before that which formed His personality, the self-conscious ego, the life-centre of His being was and remained always the Logos. This is self-evident. We shall return to this point again. At present only this. There is not the least trace in the life of Christ of a duality of persons or a duality of will in Him, but there is a twofold *consciousness* of the *one person*, namely, the consciousness of *being the Son of God*, and of *having become man*. Whenever He speaks of Himself, whether calling himself the Son of Man or the Son of God, whatever He is performing and in whatever condition we may find Him, driving out demons or tempted of the devil, Himself hungry or feeding thousands, stilling the tempest or in agony of death, on the mount of transfiguration or upon the cross, He is always the same *One* who was with the Father from eternity and one

with Him, but who had come into the world and is now living in the condition and capacity of men; the same One who was rich became poor. But the incarnation was no more a translation of divinity into humanity than it was the reverse.

But what conception can we form of the incarnation, of this entering of the Logos into human conditions and relations? Dare we assume any limitation of the divine Logos? Certainly, although we do not understand and comprehend it. All revelation of God is in some way a coming forth out of Himself and a condescension to the creature. The theophanies under the old dispensation, when Jehovah appeared in human or angelic form to the patriarchs and to others, these we do not understand either; but theophanies also include some mysterious limitation; they were the very anticipations and types of the incarnation, with this difference: what then took place sporadically was here permanent; what then was only a phenomenon became here nature by the process of human conception and birth. If it may be asked, How is this possible? the answer is, We do not know. It is not for man at all to decide what is possible with God and what not. But this we know: every thing which is not contradictory in itself is possible with God; and we know further that what is *possible for divine omnipotence* is not less possible for *divine love*.

5. Some more light will be thrown on the mystery of the incarnation when we consider the question: Who became man? Here we approach another mystery. The answer to the question is: Not the Father, not deity as such, but one person of the Godhead (Gottheit), the Son or Logos. As the Scriptures on the one hand plainly assert the divine nature of the Son of God and clearly distinguish Him from all creatures, so, on the other hand, just as clearly do they distinguish the Son from the Father—a distinction which is even implied in the names. We venture a step further. Not only does Scripture distinguish between the Father and Son, but Scripture ascribes to the Son positively a certain subordination to the Father, not only after the incarnation, but a subordination that existed

from eternity and will continue through all eternity. Many passages could be quoted in proof. We shall limit ourselves to but a few. The Father has life absolutely in Himself, the Son has life of the Father. Here may also be applied the terms : begotten and born. The Son does nothing but what He seeth the Father do, the same doth likewise also the Son. The Father is the giving One, the Son the receiving One. At the consummation of all things and the fulfillment of the kingdom of God, the Son Himself will be subject to God the Father, who had subjected all things unto the Son. If this subordination be taken as Arianism we demur ; the subjection is not the subordination of a *creature* under the *Creator*, neither is it a difference in the divine *essence*, but a difference as to the *person*, the *hypostasis* ; the subordination is the relation of the Son to the Father in the very highest, the divine sense.

6. Of the Son then we affirm that by the fact of incarnation a certain limitation of divine glory and divine perfections took place. This limitation is witnessed by the whole appearance of Christ on earth ; it must be inferred from the confession of the whole church ; and inferred if there is any truth in His humiliation, which cannot consistently be referred to anything else than to His becoming man, and living, suffering and dying as man. In proof of what has here been said we refer to St. Paul's words in his epistle to the Phil., chap. 2, vs. 5-8. The reader is requested to open his Bible and read the passage.

These words cannot well be disregarded in this connection, because they are of the greatest importance and bear directly upon the subject before us. They are very differently explained, according to the theological standpoint that some men take beforehand. Those theologians, especially of the Lutheran Church, who hold to the *Communicatio idiomatum* (maintained by the reformer Brenzcius, of Wuertenberg, and inserted in the "Formula Concordia") apply the whole passage from v. 6 to the *life of Christ on earth*. Accordingly He was in the form of God (*μορφῇ θεοῦ*) after His incarnation, and as man ; He was in full possession of all divine perfections, but He did not

make use of them or only occasionally. But how can a person be omniscient and not know all things, or possess the attribute of omnipresence and not in fact be everywhere? To avoid this dilemma, some say, He made only secret use of His divine properties, secretly He governed the world even on the cross, and so forth. Consequently, the taking upon Him the form of a servant refers to His hiding of the divine glory behind the veil of His human form, and His humiliation does not refer to His becoming man, but to special epochs in His life, His suffering and death mainly.

The arguments in favor of this explanation are the following: 1. The eternal Logos cannot be set as an example for men. 2. The incarnation as such was no humiliation. We answer: ad 1. The Logos, as He pre-existed with the Father, in the *μορφή θεοῦ*, is not set as an example for Christians, but in His humiliation of Himself and in laying aside His divine glory for their sake, in emptying Himself (*ταῦτόν ἐκένωσε*) of the form of God, etc. As He, the Son of God, in His infinite love stooped so low, to live in the condition of men and to be one with them, in order to redeem them and transform them into the divine image, so should Christians be like-minded, denying themselves, serving their brethren and their fellow-men in humble love, and showing obedience to God unto death. This is the *tertium comparationis* of the passage, and the exhortation taken in this sense is obviously much stronger. ad 2. Whether the incarnation *as such* is a humiliation or not we shall not discuss here. But under the circumstances it certainly was. He was born of a woman, born under the law, to live among sinners, to be always surrounded by sin, was attacked by sin and the powers of darkness, was born to be tempted, to suffer, to die. This was humiliation.

We believe and are convinced that the *μορφή θεοῦ* refers to the state of Christ *before* His becoming man, and the *κένωσις* refers to His *incarnation*. This is the first and natural impression which the passage makes upon every impartial and unprejudiced reader. Every other interpretation is more or less

artificial. And only in *this* sense is there full truth in the incarnation and the manhood of Christ.

7. Many Theologians deny that the personal principle, the self-conscious ego in Christ, was the Logos. They say, neither the divine nor the human exclusively, or *per se*, made up the personality, but both in their union, whereby Christ became a divine-human I or ego. But here at bottom again lies the same false principle that two different parts or beings were united. For such a personality would be neither truly divine nor truly human, but a mixture or composition of both—Eutychianism only in another form. Dr. Shedd, in his "History of Christian Doctrine," compares the person of Christ with the person of man. It is true that man, created in the image of God, offers the best illustration of the relation of the divine and human in Christ. But Dr. Shedd's comparison is a failure, for he proves in reality the opposite of that which he intends to prove. He says: "The personality (of man), the self-consciousness is the resultant of the union of the two (*i.e.*, of the body and spirit, the material and immaterial part in man) Neither one of itself makes the person." And again: "Neither the material part nor the mental part taken by itself and in separation, constitutes the personality; otherwise every human individual would be two persons in juxtaposition." We are really surprised at Dr. Shedd's reasoning. His premise is entirely wrong; hence the conclusion cannot but be wrong also. Man consists of a material and an immaterial part, of a physical and an intellectual or spiritual nature. Here, then, in man is a twofold nature, but only one personality. Now, the truth is, that the material or physical part has *no consciousness* whatever and constitutes no personality apart from the spiritual nature; but the immaterial part, the *reasonable soul* or spirit in man, is conscious of self, is an 'I, an ego *solely independent of the physical nature*. After soul and body are separated and the whole physical organism is decayed and dissolved in the grave, then the spirit (or soul) lives on in the spirit world as a self-conscious personality. Hence it follows that the *spirit* is

the life-centre ; it and *nothing else* constitutes the person, the I in man.

In regard to Christ there is another fact to be considered. The Son of God *was* a personality, an ego, before He became man ; by the incarnation His *personality* was neither *lost* nor *altered* ; He only entered into another *condition* or mode of being. If a person of high standing is degraded to the position of a servant, he still remains the *same person*, only his condition of life is changed.

8. The Son of God became so truly man and His humiliation was so real, that His whole life and work can be properly understood and is of full importance for us only if viewed in this aspect. He prayed to the Father like other pious men ; by prayer He lived in unbroken communion with the Father. He is subject to the law, and His will is always submitted to the Father's will. I came into the world, not to do my own will, but the will of the Father who sent me. This was His meat, Not as I will, but as thou wilt ; this was the key-note of His life. He exercised and learned obedience by overcoming all temptations to follow His own will, as we see especially in His struggle in the desert and still more in the agony of Gethsemane. His human condition was so forcibly apparent that it took enlightened eyes to perceive the glory of the Logos breaking forth in it. Those only whose eyes were opened were enabled to say : " We saw His glory, the glory of the only begotten of the Father."

As it was the divine Logos who entered into the natural life-sphere of humanity, it follows that, whatever is said of Christ refers to the God-Man. The God-Man was born, grew in grace, had human wants, suffered, was crucified and died ; then rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of God. He did the former in the capacity of, or in virtue of, *having become man* ; the latter in the capacity of, or in virtue of, *being the Son of God*. The nature of man furnishes an analogy, even if not altogether adequate, yet the best that can be found. Different as the physical and spiritual

natures in man are, they affect one another reciprocally in virtue of the oneness of person. When the spirit suffers, for instance, by grief, fear, sorrow, and the more intense such suffering is and the longer it lasts, the more will the whole physical frame be affected; extreme grief or extreme joy may even destroy life. So again physical pain has great influence upon psychical life. This needs no proof. In death, although the body alone dies, the whole man is concerned and feels the pangs, the pains and agonies that are generally connected with the separation of soul and body. Applying this to Christ, we say, *He*, the Son of God, who had entered into the form and condition of a servant, *He* was a man of sorrows, *He* tasted in the garden the terrors of death, *He* cried upon the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Whatever happened to the human nature also affected the divine, and this gives to the whole work of Christ infinite merit in our behalf. Hence the Bible calls the blood of Christ the blood of the Son of God, and herein lies its power to cleanse from all sins. Because Christ offered Himself to God by the eternal Spirit, *He* has perfected forever all those that are sanctified.

9. Of the same of whom the Scripture predicates a state of humiliation, it predicates also the exaltation. The same who came from the Father returned again unto Him. The Logos, who laid aside His glory when *He* became man, received it back again. In the first place, the elevation and glorification refer to the Logos; otherwise, what the Bible says has no reality. Only when viewed from this standpoint the words of Christ in His great intercessory prayer are intelligible: Glorify thou me, Father, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. *He* had this glory as the premundane Son of God, not as the Son of man.

Christ has not only *become* man, but *He remained* and *is still* upon the throne of God, at the right hand of the Father the Son of Man. His humanity is the same as it was when *He* lived on earth, as far as *nature* is concerned, but in regard to *condition* it is entirely changed; it is transformed and glorified

in and through the Logos. In order to explain this, we have again to refer to man as an analogy.

As the spirit of man in this life takes part in and is affected by that which relates to the physical nature of man without losing its spirituality and without becoming material, so shall the body, after the resurrection, take part in the glorification of the soul, without becoming soul itself or losing its materiality, its organization and whatever is peculiar to its nature. No doubt, even matter will then be greatly refined, transformed, spiritualized (*durchgeistigt*); analagous to the condition of that higher world, yet by no means annihilated. Somewhat similar it is with the human nature of Christ since His resurrection and ascension; it is filled and penetrated with divine glory, transformed, yet not losing its identity, not deified. A type of this state and condition was the transfiguration of Christ upon the mount.

After the resurrection our Lord eats and drinks with His disciples; He shows unto them the marks of His wounds and permits them to touch Him. All this He does to convince them of His identity, to prove that He was no spectre, but the very same that He was before, having flesh and bones, that is, a physical organism. He is, however, no longer confined to time and space, not limited by walls and locked doors; He makes His appearance wherever He wills, lightning-like, now here, now there, but not everywhere at the same moment. He ascends into heaven (and heaven is surely not a condition merely, but a place, a locality as well) in sight of the disciples; in the same manner, only in greater glory and majesty, He will come again at the last day, as the "two men in white apparel" declared. Stephen sees Him standing at the right hand of God; St. John beholds the Son of Man as the Lamb that was slain. Of His enemies it is said, that they will see Him whom they have pierced. It may be objected, that such language is figurative. We admit it; but realities corresponding to such figures must lie at the foundation; otherwise there would be no truth in figures, and readers would be

misguided. If the writers of the New Testament had intended to awaken and nourish the idea that nothing human is any more in the glorified Saviour; if they had had the notion of the *ubiquitas corporis Christi*, they would most assuredly have employed different language.

We believe, therefore, according to Scripture, that our Lord Jesus Christ, even now in His glory, partakes of our nature, that we have our flesh in heaven as the sure pledge that He, as the Head, will also take us, His members, up to Himself, and that His body, though radiating divine glory, is still tangible, circumscribed and only at one place at the same time. This is also substantiated by the precious promise that our bodies in the resurrection will be transformed into the likeness of His glorious body.

The *communicatio idiomatum* has no foundation in Scripture. It cannot be true, in the first place, because in the nature of the case, it admits of only a one-sided application; for to say that the human nature communicated its properties and attributes to the divine would be nonsense. The advocates of this doctrine themselves admit this. But, secondly, it annuls the reality of Christ's ascension, and turns it into an illusion, and it annihilates His human nature. For if to the human nature all divine attributes are imparted, humanity is deified, and thereby loses all that is peculiarly human. The ubiquity of the body of Christ is a contradiction of terms; for it is an indisputable law that a body, be it ever so refined, is only at one place at the same time. This doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* is nothing less than Eutychianism and monophysitism.

It is worthy of remark that Dr. Luther, who was realistic, originally understood the incarnation of Christ in its full reality, and laid great weight on His true humanity. But in his endeavor to find proofs to substantiate his view of the Lord's Supper, he took hold of the ubiquity of Christ's body. The great man overlooked that, because he tried to prove too much, he proved nothing. He was really embarrassed, and he

felt the embarrassment. The quiet, sober and impassionate spirit of investigation forsook him, and in the heat and excitement of the controversy he partly forgot himself. Hence the figures which he employed to illustrate and prove the ubiquity were so inappropriate and improper; if they demonstrated anything, they demonstrated the opposite of what he desired to prove, for who would ever call a glance through the sky or a spectre omnipresent?

10. In conclusion we shall yet, in a few sentences, point to the practical side of this subject and its great importance for Christian life and hope.

The deep speculations, the technical terms, the dogmatic definitions, and often the hair-splitting of the learned do but very little interest and benefit the Christian people in general, the common believer. There is hardly any one whose *intellect* is fully satisfied with any explanation of the divine-human being of Christ. Nevertheless it would be well if at least the more advanced Christians were a little better acquainted with the deeper and sublimer topics contained in the Christian doctrine.

The person of Christ cannot be separated from His work. "What think ye of Christ?" is still the question that must be answered in some way; and according to the answer regarding His Person, will be the answer in reference to our redemption and reconciliation. Whoever denies knowingly and willingly either the divinity or the humanity of Christ has not that Redeemer whom Scripture sets forth as the object of faith, and hence no redemption. To the question: What manner of mediator and redeemer then must we seek? the Church answers: One who is a true and sinless man, and yet more powerful than all creatures; that is, one who is at the same time true God. The Bible confirms this when it says: "He who denies the Son has not the Father." And again: "He who denies that Christ has come into the flesh is Anti-christ." But why must He be both?

As the first Adam is the head and progenitor of the whole

sinful and corrupt race, which is organically united with him by natural birth, so must Christ, the second Adam, be the head and spiritual progenitor of a new race, which is also organically united to Him by a new birth. As sin and damnation came by *man*, so righteousness and eternal life must also come by *man*. The seed of the woman was, according to the first promise, to crush the head of the serpent, and to regain what through the woman was lost. Christ can be the head of the Church in the full and true sense, and the Church can be His body in organic union with Him only if He partakes of our nature. Mankind needed a Mediator out of its own midst, and this Mediator is the man Jesus Christ.

But the whole work of Christ receives its infinite and eternal merit, its perfectly redeeming virtue, from Him, because He is the Son of God. He could not be less in order to perform and complete such a redemption. Many have a very superficial and one-sided notion of redemption. It does not consist in merely making judicial satisfaction to the justice of God, not in appeasing His anger by bearing the punishment of the guilty. Redemption is the restoration of a fallen race. It includes the destruction of sin, the vanquishing of the powers of darkness, the reconciliation of enemies and the abolishment of enmity, the healing of the breach and disruption, the renovation of the divine image in man, the impartation of righteousness and life, and the elevation to divine nature. This is truly not a work which any creature could accomplish, but only God Himself. Finally it is evident that God as absolute love could not fully manifest His love by sending any angel, even the highest, but only by sending and offering *Him* who is nearest and dearest to His own heart; for God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son!

As in Christ Godhead and manhood are united, so meet through Him and in Him the Creator and the fallen creature. Christ is the foundation and centre of this union. Peace on earth and good-will to man. God was in Christ to reconcile

the world unto Himself. This redeemed and reconciled human race, all those who are implanted into Christ, shall also be transformed and glorified through Him in spirit, soul and body. We shall be like unto the image of His Son. As we have born the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. We shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is. Then shall the prayer of our High Priest be fulfilled: "I in them and thou in me." This is the purpose, aim and goal of Christ's mediatorial work. O precious gospel that proclaims unto us such a Redeemer!

One word more. The union of redeemed mankind with Christ, and, through Him, with God, is not a pantheistical submersion into the divine. The individual self-conscious personal life remains forever, and the difference between Creator and creature can never be abrogated. It is a union of holy love. There is a perfect peace and never-ending harmony which excludes all and every discord. The life of all the redeemed has its root and source in Christ; they know that what they are, they are in Him whom as their elder brother they love with all their hearts, and adore and worship as their Saviour and eternal King.

Praise, and blessing, and honor, and glory, world without end be to Him, the God-man.

III.

HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY AS A PROOF OF THE REALITY OF CHRIST'S RESURRECTION.

BY THE LATE REV. S. H. GEISY, D.D.

IN the capital of the country there stands in prominent view a colossal monument, reared a century after the grand events it so substantially, so proudly commemorates. It gives proof, wrought in stone, of the reality of the American Revolution as an historic fact, and the pre-eminent place the central figure holds, and is destined to hold in the gratitude of the nation he so signally helped to create.

In the city bearing his honored name, massive buildings are seen on every hand. They are monumental witnesses to the governmental powers back of them—vast, multiform, effective, far-reaching. They are the direct logical issue of one event—the Declaration of Independence, made July 4, 1776, and carried to a successful end through a bitter and sanguinary struggle. They have a splendid history back of them, and in themselves are monuments of national growth and greatness as marvelous as unprecedented.

The essential elements of a government are authority, on which the stability of all depends; and constituted modes of administration embodied in laws and ordered processes for the due execution of the work with which it is charged. Its corporate entity stands in these recognized and respected institutions. Changes ensue. Rulers die. New men come into place and power. New names are engrossed on official papers. But institutions remain; parliaments and congresses and courts remain. The government holds through official changes, through lapse of centuries. And so this experiment of a government

"of the people, for the people and by the people" has stood an hundred years.

One hundred years in the life of a nation is not much. Only when the historic tie survives the chances and changes of centuries do we reach some adequate idea of national continuity. English history sweeps a thousand years. A thousand years! How different the English people of to-day and a thousand years ago, and yet it is the history of one and the same people! What changes in men, manners, methods, movements, policies, have taken place in this long lapse of time! How wonderful the development, social, political, intellectual, of that people and power on whose dominion to-day the sun never sets; and yet for a thousand years the historic unity has held unbroken! Alfred, the wisest, best and greatest king that ever reigned in England; poet, scholar, warrior, legislator, was ruling over that land a thousand years ago—the one man who deserves to be regarded as the founder of English literature, the very Solon of English laws, the unifier of English territory, the chief author of English greatness. A millennium! Human imagination can scarcely grasp it. It seems almost a representation of eternity! And yet the monumental evidence is at hand of a Kingdom that antedates far enough the British empire as we now know and see it.

Up to the early part of the fifth century, A.D. 410, Britain was itself the frontier province of that colossal empire which, in the time of Christ, dominated the world. With the march of Roman legions, went Roman law and order. In this, Rome was the world's benefactor; uniting it under one rule; giving it a settled government; bringing it under the discipline of laws; putting it under the administration of justice, and opening the highway for the inter-communication of nations. Its domain then stretched from the Libyan desert to the British Isles, and from the Euphrates to the Atlantic, giving the distant and barbarous hordes, by the protection of its legions and laws, the readier access to the Gospel of purity and peace. Everywhere the Roman eagle was the symbol and shrine of sovereignty.

The power which creates is necessary to uphold vast despotisms. A government built on military rule must be maintained by it. Hence the large standing armies in all countries save our own. The Czar of all the Russias has back of his throne an army numbering 550,000 on a peace footing simply, and with a jeopardized life can only move from the Kremlin, at Moscow, with the utmost precaution and a tremendous body-guard. The ruler has fallen on sorry times when he must be momentarily protected against his own subjects. Never was truer word spoken: "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword." The throne of the Cæsars vacated, and the mighty empire crumbles to pieces like the disintegration of granite by the action of heat and frost. The destiny of Rome is at the mercy of contending factions when, pierced by three and twenty wounds, the imperial head falls. No longer the dead Napoleon stirs his beloved France. Waterloo lost, and his name is impotent. From his island exile he marshals no armies. "Humanity mourns the men who have struggled upward, dragging humanity with them." It builds temples, modest chapels and grand cathedrals to Christ, but has no tears to shed over its fallen Napoleons and Neroes.

Back of the eighteen centuries of Christian history stands a potent, though gentle Name. It was the acknowledged purpose of Christ to establish a kingdom on the earth, universal and perpetual in character, destined to overspread the earth, to embrace humanity, to be conterminous with time, with necessary changes, suiting times and seasons, the progress of thought and culture, in which the supreme law was to be not might, but right, love of God and service to man as man, Himself exemplifying it, who came not to be ministered unto but to minister, sweeping across the ages onward to the perfect realization of that grandest, divinest ideal—a kingdom of uniform and universal righteousness and truth. His first spoken word is to this effect, so the Evangelist tells us: "Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues and *preaching* the Gospel of the Kingdom."

In the depression and low estate of the Davidic, the Mes-

sianic kingdom, its future dominion and glory, already occupied a conspicuous place in the prophetic Scriptures. Judea was to be pre-eminent among the nations, but under a different conception and form altogether from the Jewish anticipation in the time of Christ. It came to be that in being itself the original seat of a kingdom whose compass should be the world, and its limit humanity.

Any examination of the Synoptic Gospels shows the utmost unanimity in the full and candid avowal of this sublime ambition. In the Sermon on the Mount, the most remarkable discourse that ever fell from human lips, even as reported by St. Matthew, Christ takes the rôle of a legislator and declares the principles and laws of the Christian Commonwealth, as different as well could be from the governments of earth. To make specific quotations here would be to transcribe the great bulk of the first three Gospels. That the apostles did themselves, in the first instance, mistake the nature of the kingdom, conceiving of it after the false Messianic ideas of their age, is very evident.

Only in the fourth Gospel does the spiritual conception come prominently forward, in the Master's own words. On the very threshold of His active ministry to the sagacious, intelligent, profoundly thoughtful but timidly prudent Nicodemus, who, like all his countrymen, had been indulging the dream of a kingdom vying with the old Roman in magnificence and splendor, He gives this explicit statement: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God"—and further on, under the image of the wind, shows the means of its establishment to be, not the carnal weapons of worldly powers, but the Spirit's quickening breath. In a word, here is to be the play of holy and heavenly powers, influences sweet and gracious, from above. More positively the same thing is set forth in this declaration to the cynical Pilate: "My Kingdom is not of this world; if My Kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is My kingdom not from hence."

Yet there can be, in no practical sense and effect, a kingdom

without corporate character—outward, visible, historic form. Asked, then, to specify when and where, and how, this plain intimation of a kingdom on earth, spiritual in aim and action, took on external presence and power, actual constitution and form, so that its history can be clearly traced, and its operations defined along the centuries, there can be neither uncertainty nor hesitation in pointing to the Christian Church as it has come down from the very day of Pentecost, and still stands among us with heavenly powers for heavenly ends. The marvel of that distant day has been the very miracle of history. It dates the world's regeneration and higher life, and carries in its bosom, from age to age, resources of a spirituality of being, affecting all the powers of our nature, all the relations of society, all conditions and classes of mankind.

It was with Pagan society this spiritual kingdom first came into conflict, leaving the most ineffaceable way-marks, monumental proofs of its purity and tremendous power, in the correction of social evils and shocking immoralities. Classic writers themselves draw an awful picture of the moral state of society. Mostly expurgated editions of their writings are now at hand, lest the morals of our times suffer seriously by evil association.

Contact with impurity is ever hurtful. Early Christianity finds itself at once confronted with the most serious problem. Will it sink utterly out of sight under, or battle successfully against, the waves of corruption it must encounter? One need only read the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans to learn how a holy apostle shudders at the thought of such vile social contact. We can only turn away from the recital of the vile things in common, unblushing practice, with utter horror and disgust. Matthew Arnold puts into poetic lines this dark state of ancient society:

"On the hard Pagan world disgust
And sated loathing fell;
Deep weariness and sated lust
Made human life a hell."

Though robed in tissue of silver, within blaspheming Herod was eaten of worms. Lust and cruelty were the two prevailing vices of the old world, eating at the very heart of society. Can anything change this wretched state of things? Was it and how was it changed? The reign of the infamous Nero and that of Constantine the Great, A.D. 306, the first *Christian* emperor, though by no means at all anything what the word now implies, furnishes reading altogether different, and presents the unmistakable evidence of a social reform wholesome and wide-spread. Only a century later, Alaric threw his barbarian hordes against the walls of Rome, and conquered it, only in turn to be conquered of Christ and His Church. It is always to ennoble, refine, sweeten, cleanse the common, every-day life of man, that Christian purity touches the social circle.

In his "Seekers after God" Canon Farrar gives this graphic sketch of old Roman society: "We can but stand at the cavern's mouth and cast a single ray of light into its dark depths. Were we to enter, our lamps would be quenched by the foul things which cluster round it." Christian light and purity pressed into the horrid cavern and were not quenched. On the other hand, the darkness lifts. The atmosphere clears. The vileness hides itself, as slimy lizards make for abysmal retreats when the light of day is poured into their cavernous abodes. A high tone of morality shows itself. Infamous customs are abandoned or abated. A sense of the sacredness of human life is awakened, and the exposition of infants, approved even by such high and venerated names as Aristotle and Plato, measurably disappears. The gladiatorial contests where for wild and brutal amusement, human beings matched themselves with ferocious beasts, and in which as high as 10,000 combatants take part in the incredibly short space of four months, give way to a growing refinement of sentiment, and tender women no longer stay to grace with their presence and approval the revolting spectacles.

Literature and art, no less than the social life of a people, are the reflex and true exponent of their moral state. The

pen, the pencil and chisel always make the readiest channel for the expression of sentiments and ideas. Greece and Rome stood unrivaled in sculpture as in literature. But art was sensuous and shameless, as was literature sad and stained.

At once Christian ideas are grafted on to these living roots of thought and life. Greek, the common language of the world, flexible in expression, lending itself supplely to the nicest distinctions, forms the convenient and well-nigh universal medium for the Communication of Divine truth. The Christian Scriptures are written in Greek, forming the imperishable monuments of Christ's unique person, character and work, more enduring than Egyptian pyramid, more widely known and read. Greek genius gives Christian thought its profoundest and clearest utterance. Outside of the sacred writings, inspired directly by the reality of the evangelical facts, there sprang up a Christian literature splendid in names and achievements. Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Chrysostom, he of the golden mouth, may well take rank with Demosthenes in thought and power. This vast body of early Christian literature, Greek and Latin, is of double value—a witness to the prevalence of counter-thought, and a tribute to the power and vitality of the truth. It lived in spite of Celsus and the Jew Trypho, and Julian the apostate. What immortal milestones, the Church fathers, pre-and post-Nicene, planted all along the contested path of Christianity! The faith antagonized and ridiculed lived on in a Cyprian, and an Augustine, brought to Christianity from the very slums of vice and low life; and is it saying at all too much that it will live on in spite of every Volney and Voltaire, every Strauss, and Renan, and scurrilous Ingersoll?

Art, too, gives us a deep and direct insight into the soul of a people. It may be rude at first, but it shows unmistakably the tenacity and drift of ideas. The study of Egyptian monuments and their hieroglyphic inscriptions has been most enthusiastically pursued; and it has pierced the secret of that primitive civilization, its life, and faith, and worship. The silent

Catacombs at Rome, with their labyrinthian passages and their subterranean inscriptions and figures, yield alike monumental proofs to the tenacity of a faith that would suffer itself to be banished to "the caves and dens of the earth" rather than deny and disown its Master. What witnesses we have here to the imperishable character of the Christian faith!

Volney gave the Christian archæologist a two-edged sword with which to smite his opposition to Christ and His Church when he says: "I will inquire of the monuments of antiquity what was the wisdom of former ages; in the very bosom of the sepulchres I will invoke the Spirit that formerly in Asia gave splendor to states and glory to their people." Making this appeal to the numerous monuments of Christianity in the Roman Catacombs, the patient archæologist has brought to open day the abundant memorials of its truth, challenging admiration because of the purity and heroism they signalize in the very centre of debauched and worn-out paganism.

Rawlinson puts the argument irresistibly and fairly when he says of the early documents of Christianity: "Till recently these have been generally regarded as presenting the whole existing proof of the faith and practice of the early Church; and skeptics have therefore been eager to throw every possible doubt upon them and to maintain that forgery and interpolation have so vitiated this source of knowledge as to render it altogether untrustworthy. Under these circumstances it is well that attention be called to the *monumental remains* of early Christian times, still extant, and which take us back in the most lively way to the first ages of the Church, exhibiting before our eyes those primitive communities which Apostles founded, over which Apostolic men preside, and in which confessors and martyrs were almost as numerous as ordinary Christians. As when we tread the streets of Pompeii we have the life of the old pagan world brought before us with a vividness which makes all other representations appear dull and tame, so when we descend into the Catacombs at Rome we seem to see the struggling, persecuted community which there

wrought itself a hidden home, whence it went forth at last conquering and to conquer, triumphantly establishing itself on the minds of the old religion, and bending its heathen persecutors to the yoke of Christ."

In his invaluable work, "Monumental Christianity," Dr. Lundy says: "Article by article of the Creed can be verified in the early monuments of Christianity, both in sculpture, painting and mosaic; and the Faith has come down to our times so pure only because it was enshrined in hearts that had learned it, amid the fires of persecution, from the symbols on the walls of their subterranean chapels, and through their careful instruction in holy things before admission to the sacred mysteries."

In the closing hours of the Lord's life, when the shadow of the cross was dark upon His path, He said this of a woman's loving and prefigurative act: "Wheresoever this Gospel be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, that this woman hath done, be told for a *memorial* of her." Only a little later, in the same hours of growing darkness, He did Himself ordain that Christian institution—the pledge of unflinching love, the bond of undying faithfulness, the divine means of grace—which is still observed the world over under one form of administration or another. Later on, when the grave had again given Him for a space back to earth, He instituted the Sacrament of Holy Baptism in these words of divine authority to His disciples, and by them to the Church through the ongoing of the ages: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

The Font and the Altar are never absent from a Christian Church, be it way-side chapel or grand Cathedral. Their place is conspicuous and central. They enshrine the perennial presence and power of a love, a mercy and grace which belong to humanity, and have come down from the one only Source. The evidential value of their continued and world-wide observance is immense and undeniable. Like the old historic Creeds formulated in the early days of Christianity,

and still devoutly recited everywhere, so they yet stand as the living memorials of a living Christianity.

Si monumentum quaeris, circumspice. Yes, if you would see the monuments of a living Christianity, look around. In every province, city, town stand great and small buildings devoted to the faith and worship of Christ. A Christian ministry, mostly holding in its primitive form, inséparable from the integrity and perpetuation of the Church, stands for authoritative preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. A Christian Sunday throws its holy calm over the secular world and opens wide its places of holy worship. And everywhere Christian charity has raised up its institutions of mercy and kindly ministrations to distressed and afflicted humanity. The corporate tie survives the lapse of centuries in the spread of the Church, following the course of empires, from Pentecost and Jerusalem to Philippi and European soil, from the old to the new world.

"By what power or by what name" has all this been done? There must be for it all a basis and foundation in fact. This Church, which in historic character holds thus through a chequered history in the world, St. Paul denominates "the Pillar and Ground of the Truth." But is it without pillar and ground itself, without adequate cause, "the baseless fabric of a vision?"

A dead Christ could never thus hold the faith of the world. A dead Christ could never make a living Christianity. "A crucified Christ mouldering in the tomb never could have moved and shaken to its centre and revolutionized the Roman empire, and on the ruins of its idolatry and pagan civilization built up historic Christendom."

A dead Cæsar commands no shrines and temples and devotion. A dead Christ just as little would fill the world with Churches, humble and grand, and create a universal homage and worship, simple or elaborate,

"Binding the hearts of millions till they move as one."

The secret of it all lies in this article of the ecumenical Creed: "The third day he rose again from the dead."

IV.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE MEANING OF THE PHRASE, "BORN OF WATER."

BY REV. CHRISTIAN VAN DER VEEN, D.D.

"Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh: and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."—JOHN III. 5, 6.

MANY different interpretations of this passage may be found in books, but two views have hitherto been current in the Christian church, neither of which seems satisfactory.

The traditional view is that water here stands for the sacrament of baptism. Either for baptism in general, that is, the idea in baptism; or for the Baptism of John, of which Nicodemus knew; or for Christian baptism, referred to proleptically. This interpretation makes baptism an essential factor in saving experience; for then the passage reads, "Except a man be baptized and born of the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God." This is not denied by the great majority of those who hold this view of the passage. This was the uniform claim of the ancient fathers down to the Reformation. The Roman Catholic Church builds its doctrine of baptismal regeneration on this passage first. It is still held by the Sacramentarian Protestant Churches. These aver that without water baptism the influence of the Holy Spirit need not be looked for. The only uncertainty is, they say, as to the relative sequence of the two in the experience of the individual.

Now, if water here refers to baptism, this inference cannot be successfully disputed. If the Lord combines water and Spirit

as means and agency, He lays equal emphasis on both. The passage is the corner-stone of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

The other view current takes the words figuratively and makes the two words refer to the same agency. Water and Spirit signify the cleansing Spirit. It justifies this interpretation by the grammatical figure, hendiadys. Admittedly this interpretation is the result of doctrinal demand. The stress laid in the traditional view on the sacramental means as essential for entrance into the Kingdom of God is not consistent with the uniform teaching of the Scriptures on the conditions of salvation, and does not agree with the experience of the Church of Christ or the Christian consciousness. Hence some other interpretation must be found.

But one cannot escape the impression that this interpretation does injustice to the text. The expression becomes too pleonastic for the occasion, which is most solemn and important. The references to the Old Testament usage of water as a symbol for Spirit do not fit, for the Lord does not here speak of lustration; washing, cleansing from sin, but of life, birth, creation, a new beginning of existence. Then the impression is unavoidable that He speaks here of two births and not merely of one. These difficulties will always give to the second interpretation but a limited reception. As between the two, unbiased scholars will continue to give the preference to the first interpretation, toning down the essentiality of that first birth as they best can by counter-considerations.

But the objections to the first view are indeed insuperable. Their force will be felt more and more, and will be more generally acknowledged as the Christian church continues to shake itself free from mechanical views of religion, from traditionalism, ecclesiasticism, sacramentarianism and kindred errors. Hence there is room, and, we think, a growing demand for an exegesis which will do justice to the text, and get rid of views that conflict with Scriptural conceptions of the Kingdom of God and the relations of man to it.

Hence we submit a view which we think does no injustice to

the text, and certainly none to sound doctrine, starting from the premise that the text mentions *two* births and not one—born of water, born of Spirit.

Many years ago, in studying this part of the Word carefully, it struck me that there was in the words of the Lord no reference to Baptism at all. It seemed to me that a mistake is made in disconnecting the sixth verse from the fifth; that the Lord Himself furnished the true explanation of the disputed phrase in v. 5 by repeating its great truth in a more intelligible form in v. 6; that to be "born of water" and "born of the flesh" are equivalent phrases. The two verses might then be paraphrased thus: It is not enough that a man is born once if he would enter the kingdom of God, for that he must be born of the Spirit also, by a second birth. Why? Because his first birth, being of the flesh, could only produce flesh; spirit is born of spirit only. Now, as Paul said afterward, flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. For that one must be Spirit, because the kingdom is a spiritual thing. The receiving of the Spirit is the reception of a real, a new life; hence an experience which is equivalent to a second birth.

The objections which may be and have been urged against this view are three: 1. The lack of *usus loquendi* for the phrase in that sense. This we will consider later. 2. Water is never used in Scripture for flesh. This is true, but irrelevant. 3. That natural birth is not at all a condition of admission into the kingdom of God. This may or may not be true. It depends on how one looks at natural life; or for what purpose a fact so trite, and usually superfluous in this connection, is asserted. We might reply to such an objection, that one who is not born at all cannot be a candidate for the kingdom at all. From that point of view it would be a very essential, nay, the first condition. The being born into this world is so evident a condition to a higher life, that ordinarily it need not be mentioned. There may be circumstances, however, which so bring out its importance as a first condition, that appeal is properly made to God's miracle-working power to

fulfill that first condition, as was seen in the case of Isaac, Jacob, John the Baptist, and Jesus. So also there may be such a view of ordinary birth, of the value of natural descent, as connected with special spiritual prerogatives and claims, that it demands most serious consideration as a condition. This is, in fact, very common in the world. So common, that religious teachers find it constantly necessary to call attention to the insufficiency of the advantages which natural birth gives, and to warn against the dangers of making too much of distinctions based on the simple fact of present existence. Other objections, like these: that "flesh is uniformly employed to express the principle which is *opposed* to the Holy Spirit;" that "natural birth, that of the flesh, shuts a man out of the Kingdom;" that "flesh and water are directly opposed to each other in the text"—are crude and extravagant, and not true without important qualifications. They require no confuting.

Let us look carefully at the whole passage, and then we can the better estimate their weight and relevancy.

The passage as a whole—vs. 1-21—is sublime and of paramount importance. In its general scope as a gospel to be taught to men it is most lucid. It sets forth the real nature of the Kingdom of God, as seen in the light of the new life of the Spirit and of the mission of the Son of God. It reveals the love of God as the foundation and source of this great gift. It teaches the immediate and future bearing of this kingdom upon the world as it is. All this the simplest believer can understand and live by. But in the details of the passage are many difficult questions and obscure points. It is not a passage to be interpreted solely with the use of grammar and lexicon. In this all agree. There are allusions in it upon which we have no sufficient historic light. It contains phrases peculiar to the writer of this gospel, and upon which usage by other writers casts no ray. If, for instance, we knew just what John understood and meant to express by "*δυωθεν*," which Nicodemus interpreted by "*δεύτερον*," which the Old Version renders "again," and the Revised "anew," and whose first meaning is

"from above," and for which John himself elsewhere apparently substitutes *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, we should get a more definite conception of what the phrase "being born of the flesh," as its contrast, implied. Or, if we knew what the phrase "born of water," used in Scripture but this once, stood for in John's intention, we should not need to dispute about its meaning, as it has long been disputed. Or even, if we knew absolutely just where the conversation between these two persons ends, or what in the passage are the words of the Lord and what are explanatory statements by the Evangelist, it might aid us in a better understanding of some parts. Or, if we were better acquainted with this scribe, and with the circumstances of his visit and the real object of it under the cover of night; if even the Lord had allowed him to finish his first sentence, so that we might know what he was actually going to say: whether to ask a question, or make a proposal, or raise a difficulty, we should have a better idea of particular parts of the interview. But we lack this definite knowledge and must guess at it from closely studying the passage in connection with the whole gospel, and the Lord's relation to men like Nicodemus. We must infer much from the evident attitudes of Nicodemus and Jesus towards each other as it comes out in their conversation.

In the immediate passage the essential things to be considered are not merely the words, but their connection with what precedes and follows. And not less important is their relation to the man to whom they were spoken, and the question of what they would mean to him. Would he understand the reference in them to be to natural birth or to baptism? Let us inquire about these things. Who was this man, and what was the character and significance of the whole interview?

The man was Nicodemus, a Pharisee and Scribe. A leading Jew, perhaps it were not unjust to call him the leading Jew at that time. He was a great Rabbi, perhaps the *chakam*, the Teacher (John iii. 10). This was a position not merely of official distinction, as the Highpriesthood and the Presidency of the Sanhedrin might be considered to be—places to which

favoritism or intrigue, instead of fitness, might exalt one—but a position of commanding influence through intellectual superiority and larger knowledge of the law. As such he would be the guide of the Sanhedrin in the important questions which concerned Israel's highest, that is, spiritual, interests. As such he would be the chief of the Scribes and Pharisees, whose aim it was to protect the orthodoxy of the chosen people, and save the nation from pagan influences and fanatical impostors, who, in those days of unrest, might presume to take advantage of Israel's expectation and pervert the Messianic hopes.

If we are allowed to ascribe to him this character, Nicodemus is altogether a fit man to hold converse with Jesus about the matters treated of in this conference, and which were far in advance of Christ's usual preaching. As a representative of the most prominent religious body, the men of most serious views and largest zeal, the Lord might well grant so important an interview as is here recorded. And because of this importance, which gives it an official character, it is preserved. In general it is true, that the episodes and conversations which make up so large a part of this Gospel were not written because of their local value or bearing on the destiny of individuals, but because of their relation to the kingdom of God as a whole, illustrating its principles and development and application to large and representative classes. As an interview with a mere individual, however noted, it is not likely that this scene would have been preserved. Nor is it too much to say that the Lord would not have intrusted the Revelation of great truths, which He as yet hid from His disciples, to a Pharisee like Nicodemus, if He designed only to press him into discipleship. Nay, I take it to be this which both induced and justified our Lord in holding converse with this man, after he gave evidence in his flippant words and irreverent objections, how personally unfit he was to receive the mysteries of the Kingdom. Christ was dealing with the Teacher of Israel, and was through him bringing the full Revelation of God in Himself to the headquarters of the nation. If this Rabbi or chakam brought a

true report of what he heard that evening to the Sanhedrin, then the Elders of Israel knew what God had sent to them in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. If this teacher taught the people what this new Prophet had taught him, then they knew that God had sent to them a Saviour, even His own Son, who had opened and shown to them the way into the Kingdom.

Now it seems plain that Nicodemus came in such representative character.

If we go back to Chapter i., we find that when John the Baptist was at the height of his success, the Sanhedrin sent a deputation to him to inquire about his mission and work (John i. 19-24; Matt. iii. 7-12). They got little satisfaction out of that investigation—only this: a satisfactory explanation that John did not claim to be the Messiah (John i. 20-22); a sharp rebuke for their own shortcomings (Matt. iii. 7-12); and a reference to a coming One, as One who also had already come, and in whom they would find the Messiah (John i. 23, 26, 27; Matt. iii. 11, 12; John i. 29-34). This interview was public, in the hearing of men, and did not add to the prestige of the Sanhedrin as religious leaders of the people.

After a time Jesus appears with the Messianic claim as foretold by John. He has spoken and men are becoming His disciples (John i. 35-51). He is performing miracles that are already being talked about (John ii. 1-11). He has appeared in the temple, indeed, with a fan in His hand to thoroughly purge His threshing-floor. He has cleansed the temple as only a messenger from God would presume to do (John ii. 13-17). To some of them who were bold enough at the moment to demand the Messianic sign, He had made reply, but in an enigmatical way which they did not understand (John ii. 18-22). Many were being won by His signs and believed on Him, and were ready to admit His claims. It is time for the Sanhedrin to investigate Him as they had examined the Baptist.

Now Nicodemus appears on the scene. Not in a private capacity. His very first words forbid that supposition: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher sent from God." By that

"we" he speaks for and in behalf of others. He comes as the messenger of the Sanhedrin. It is a repetition of their previous investigation of Messianic claims, and in the line of their duty (see Deut. xiii. and xviii.) But they improve on that interview with John. Instead of sending a delegation of many, they send one, their chakam. Instead of a public interview, they seek for a more private occasion. Their great man goes in the darkness of the evening to the house where Jesus of Nazareth was lodging: perhaps at a house of the disciple John, who probably was the only witness present.

It is not necessary to think that the object was malignant. Give these rulers credit for earnestness of purpose, for a sense of responsibility as religious guides, and for a willingness to learn and receive the fulfillment of the Prophetic words for which they and all Israel were waiting. It is to misread those times and their signs, to depreciate the control which religious questions, and especially the Messianic hope, had upon the men of that day. It was a time of intense interest in every phenomenon which seemed to offer an explanation or fulfillment of the great expectation. It is true that the religious life was divorced from godliness in life, but, as experience has proved through all ages, that does not diminish the intellectual interest in religious questions, but may rather quicken it. What did the Sanhedrin talk about so much as the coming deliverance through the Messiah? For they were weary of foreign oppression and domestic intrigue and secular government under the Herods' scandalous and cruel reigns.

Both John and Jesus were striking characters to the rulers, and well deserved their investigation and perhaps their patronage. John could not have been to them a sudden apparition, of whom they needed to take no notice because his antecedents were unknown and his pretensions contemptible. For that was not so. He was the son of a priest, and some of the priesthood must have been acquainted with him. The remarkable circumstances of his birth could not have been unknown to all of them, for, according to Luke's Gospel, these had been made

public. Something of the promises associated with his birth must still have been remembered, for his father proclaimed them in the temple (Luke i. 59-79). The career of this strange child, born out of the ordinary course of nature, must have been watched with interest by many, as is implied in Luke i. 80. The silences of the Gospels have their significance, and we must fill them up from the spoken setting that environs them with their luminous presence.

In the same way, Jesus of Nazareth could not be altogether unknown among the rulers of Israel. They could easily know that He was of David's line, for they faithfully kept the genealogical records. They had reason to discover His position in the royal succession. The expectation of the restoration of the kingdom of David was kept alive with increasing fervor. Whenever they looked up the matter they could not but trace the right to rule to Joseph of Bethlehem and his reputed Son Jesus. It appears from the gospels that, without pushing His claim, Jesus became early and generally known as the Son of David. (See Matt. ix. 27; xii. 23; xv. 22, *et al.*) How soon we are not told. Granted that the flight into Egypt and the removal to Nazareth served mainly to obliterate the remembrance of the wonderful things that happened at His birth in Bethlehem, or to destroy their connection with this Son of Joseph, yet Jesus did not live altogether in a corner before His thirtieth year. At least three times a year, since His twelfth year, He had come to Jerusalem. At His first visit as a child He had made a profound impression upon the Rabbis of the temple, some of whom were, without doubt, still in the Council. That could not have died right out. His behaviour then must have given some of the elders a permanent interest in the career of this earnest, gifted Boy, and disposed them to look for greater things in His life. There is no reason to think that the marvelous testimonies of Simeon and Anna could be totally forgotten, or that their influence could wholly disappear from among men. Thus there were links between the religious leaders and these new prophets.

Hence we understand how when John was manifested—publicly set forth—to Israel, all were ready for him, including the Pharisees and rulers. (Matt. iii. 5-7). As already said, they were disappointed in him and offended at his message, but they had not ignored him. And he gave them testimony concerning Jesus which they could not ignore. If John i. 29-34 was spoken to these rulers, as seems reasonable from the connection, he gave them full testimony concerning Jesus as the Son of God. Nor needed this designation be offensive to them. It was an Old Testament term, and they could attach their own meaning to it, as they doubtless did. From later portions of the gospel of John it is plain that the rulers knew Jesus, and had their ideas about Him. Nor could they willingly have given up their hopes as connected with the promise in Him given by John. There are evidences that this interest in Jesus lingered among them. The Lord constantly acknowledged this interest. See John v. 32-47. In John vii. and later, we have implied admissions of His claims. See vs. 23, 36, 48, etc. Instructive on this point is Nicodemus' timid defense and the answer of the other members of the Sanhedrin (vs. 49-53).

Now all this furnishes the reason why at this particular juncture Nicodemus should come to Jesus as the messenger and representative of his brethren. And it explains his language at the opening of the conference: "*We know that THOU art a teacher sent from God.*" As if he had said: "We, the Sanhedrin, have examined your claims as the possible Messiah. We are favorably disposed to them. In fact, we have agreed that you have a divine mission as a prophet, for we neither care nor wish to deny the reality of your wonderful deeds." Does not Nicodemus in such words draw a contrast between Jesus and John to John's disparagement? They had once hoped and thought so of John also, but he had disappointed them, denounced them, and declared that he would have nothing to do with them as religious leaders. (Matt. iii. 7-9). He had forfeited their confidence. Now they were willing to accept and acknowledge Jesus as the Prophet on certain conditions or terms.

What were these terms? We shall never know, for Jesus does not allow this delegate to finish his first utterance, but interrupts him before he can submit his main proposition.

For additional evidence of this representative character, attention is called to the remarkable use of the singular and plural pronouns in the interview. Nicodemus begins with the plural, *we*. Jesus, perfectly understanding the man and his business, ignores at first his embassy, and replies: "Verily, verily *I* say to *thee*," and it becomes at once a personal interview. This is kept up until the eleventh verse, (except in v. 8, "Ye must be born again," all of you in whose name thou art here). Then the Lord changes it thus: "*We* speak that *we* do know, and *we* testify to that *we* have seen"—*we*, John and I, both prophets, equally the subjects of investigation by the rulers—"and ye"—the investigators for whom Nicodemus appears—"accept not our testimony." Then in v. 12 the Lord calls attention to His testimony as the thing which specially claims their faith: "If *I* speak to you . . . and ye believe not." He does not allow the rulers to separate Him from His forerunner in any invidious way so as to discredit the really divine testimony which John had given them concerning Jesus as the Christ and the Lamb of God. He confirms and enlarges this testimony (vs. 11-17). They are heavenly things and true. As John had said, Jesus was the Christ, the Lamb of God, the possessor of the Holy Spirit, the Son of God. Jesus says of Himself, He is also the Son of man, who belongs in heaven, the gift of God to the world, the bringer-in of eternal life.

I have said the purpose in this conference need not be considered malignant, but neither was it thoroughly sincere and on the level of Jesus Christ and His Kingdom. It seems plain to me from John's gospel, that it was at first the policy of the Pharisees to detach Jesus from John and to capture this new Prophet and attach Him to their interests through flattery and patronage. They kept this up long. When the Lord allowed them they were willing to make much of Him, and they often invited Him to their feasts. It belonged to the temptations of

the Lord's life to be captured by the Ecclesiastics. And the great bitterness of the Sanhedrin and Pharisees afterward developed, was largely due to their disappointment and failure in this scheme.

The Lord was no party to all this and was never blind to their policy. That is the meaning of His cutting off Nicodemus' first remark when it is hardly begun, by abruptly turning the conversation into a new channel, thus: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born from above he cannot enter the kingdom of God." The Lord leaves room here for whatever mixture of motives led to the conference. If these rulers were sincerely desirous of establishing a connection between themselves as religious guides of the people and Himself as the divinely sent Prophet, here was the only proper platform. Their proposals then concerned the Kingdom of God, not His personal claims. Then they must meet in a new sphere, into which they must first get by a new birth.

This answer did not favorably impress Nicodemus. It thwarted the object of his visit, and as a serious proposal, this saying of Jesus was to him irrelevant if not unintelligible. So much so that he could afford to cast ridicule on it by representing it in a gross form as an absurdity. Ignoring or belittling that "from above" into "once more," a second time, he sneers, "Why, that which you propose cannot be done. Birth is a physical experience which cannot be repeated. If it were possible, it would not need to be done in our case. We are well enough born as we are." The Lord is too serious to allow Himself to be diverted by the offensiveness of the man, and simply—but we can imagine with what solemn stress—repeats it in larger form: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of Heaven."

Now it seems to me, that if in this word "born of water," there is a reference to baptism, the word is not apposite. In the sense of ordinary birth, it is a natural and fitting answer to the flippant question which called it forth. These questions referred only to natural birth. "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb

and be born?" This man knew only of fleshly birth. He does not say, as he is so often made to say by commentators: "Yes, I understand that you are speaking of a so-called new birth by lustration or baptism, but that is for proselytes and has nothing to do with me, who am a Jew." Not at all. He objects to going through the same process which he had once undergone as a babe coming into this world. But his objection was quite superfluous and irrelevant as well as superficial. To be born of the flesh once is enough. As bearing at all upon an ultimately higher destiny of existence it need not be repeated. But it does need to be supplemented by a birth of the Spirit. This man should understand that, and being what he was, it would be very pertinent to his case as a candidate for the kingdom, and not yet its possessor. For such he was in common with all Israelites and as such he was addressed.

The reference to natural birth in Nicodemus' words is evident. Now, does the Lord, in this second word, shift the ground and say: When I spoke to you of a higher birth, I was not referring to one supplementary to natural birth, but to sacramental birth? I say that would have been justly unintelligible to Nicodemus. Whatever may have been the place of baptism under the Old Testament dispensation, as an initiatory rite typical of an entrance into the kingdom of heaven, represented by the Jewish Church, it had value possibly only for proselytes. The Lord could not demand that as a condition in the case of this ruler. Certainly Nicodemus had never been "born of water" in any such sense. If the reference is held to be to John's baptism, there is no proof that Nicodemus or any of the rulers were baptized; but there is proof that John refused to baptize them (Matt. iii. 7). There is also no proof that Jesus, in this passage or at any other occasion, required these rulers first to be baptized. Evidently, Nicodemus did not so understand the Lord, nor did Jesus say another word to enforce such a demand. Nor do we find in the Gospels a trace of such a demand in the preaching of Christ and the apostles. The reference in Luke vii. 30 is a condemnation of the Phari-

sees for rejecting John as a prophet, as in Matt. xxi. 25, but not a plea for John's baptism as an essential experience in the kingdom of heaven. In fact, John's baptism did not signify entrance into the kingdom of heaven, for that was not yet come. It was only at hand and coming.

John's baptism was simply a baptism unto repentance, such as should fit men to receive the Christ as the Lamb of God that taketh away sin. It anticipated Christian baptism, but was not its equivalent (Acts xix. 1-7). It was not a new birth, nor the symbol of a new birth. When the Lord spoke this word, baptism as a sacrament was still unknown and unthought of. It would be preposterous to say, as the traditional view implies, that Nicodemus was placing such value on having been born anew by baptism, that he thought he could dispense with the birth of the Spirit, and that he needed special instruction on that point. Nicodemus had no such idea. He could not have, for Christian baptism, which has indeed been such a snare to many, was to him an unheard-of thing, and the Lord could not converse with him about it. But, in common with all Jews, and especially the rulers, this man did place such value on mere natural birth as to feel above the necessity of spiritual birth. That was one of their main errors, and it seriously interfered with their reception of the kingdom. They made everything of their carnal birth and descent. They said: "We have Abraham to our father." And John had warned them of the danger of the conclusions which they drew from that fact. To the end, they cast it back at the Lord as a sufficient offset to His demands: "We are Abraham's seed" (John viii. 38, 39). Until this day they reject the Son of God upon this ground: We are the people of God through descent. It was then, as now, quite sufficient, in their opinion, to insure them any place in that kingdom into which they had been born by nature.

It is this error—their deadly error—which Jesus combats, not that of the insufficiency of baptism. And He says so plainly in v. 6. But v. 6 is not a new and independent statement. It depends on and is explanatory of that which goes before. It

is this truth which the Lord unfolds in the following words, in which He gradually reveals the lofty and spiritual plane of the kingdom of God; so far above the religious plane on which the Jews lived with altogether earthly, fleshly conceptions. And it was this which both puzzled and impressed this Teacher of Israel and his brethren as a new and unheard-of thing, an inconceivable doctrine and dangerous; for to them it seemed to cast discredit on the whole dispensation and on the covenant which God had made with Abraham, and out of which the chosen people had come forth as a holy Seed. In this shape Paul afterwards met and answered the objection. See Romans ix.-xi. Most certainly, the reference to natural birth would first and most easily suggest itself to a Jew.

It remains, however, that the expression is unusual, and through the importance which baptism, as a rite, afterward obtained in the Christian Church it is liable to mislead. This must be acknowledged. But this furnishes no sufficient reason for the common interpretation.,

Let us see, therefore, whether further light can be thrown on the passage. According to the traditional view, there is mention in the whole passage of three kinds of birth—natural, sacramental, spiritual: "born of the flesh, of water, of Spirit." This is, from a scriptural point of view, not only exceptional, but unintelligible. Possibly it is true that the Rabbis were wont to speak to Proselytes of a new birth through lustration, by which a Gentile became a Jew; but it is, to say the least, a low view of the Scripture presentation of regeneration to find the connection at that point. It is not credible that the Lord Jesus, in speaking to a leading religious teacher, should start from that dubious fact. To a student of the Old Testament, as Nicodemus must have been, the new birth could not have been an unknown formula within strictly Jewish relations, even if he thought himself not to come under its need, for the reference to new inward conditions, a new heart, a new life, a new world, were numerous enough in the Prophetic writings. But there is no mention in them of three states or modes of life.

Two is all—a natural and a spiritual: an earthly and a heavenly. To be born of the flesh, or in a carnal sense, we all know what that means; to be born of the Spirit, or in a spiritual or heavenly sense, we can know what that means; but what it means to be born of water, unless it be a synonym for the one or the other of these, we cannot understand, and the Scriptures throw no light on that. The unnumbered attempts to explain it have thus far only served to darken the matter and confuse men's notions about sacraments, which, to most Christians, seem to be hindrances rather than helps to clearer perceptions of faith. Baptism may be a symbol of spiritual birth, and may be by metonymy used for it, and may even, in a sense, be said to be equivalent to it, when the baptism and regeneration coincide as experiences; but there is no warrant in Scripture for the opinion that Baptism is the entrance into a state of existence or life, distinct from natural or spiritual life, unless it be found in this passage. But this one passage is not enough to establish it, without corroborating evidence. As a matter of fact, the connection of water with regeneration or the idea of spiritual birth in the sacrament is rare in Scripture, if not unknown. In the Old Testament, the passages, of which Ezek. xxxvi. 25 may be taken as the type, which promise a new dispensation with new spiritual blessings, employ water as the symbol of cleansing. It signifies the special blessing of remission of sins, the purifying of the heart and life. And so it is used in the New Testament in Ephes. v. 26; Heb. x. 22, and presumably also in Titus iii. 5, 6. So the apostles presented baptism: "Be baptized and wash away thy sins" (Acts xxii. 16) rather than be baptized and be regenerated. The truth is, water is a symbol of cleansing in Baptism. It is a bath (*λουτρόν*) rather than a birth (*γένεσις*). What connection there is in Scripture between water and life or the idea of becoming is confined to natural or physical life. There is certainly no other text than this, unless it be Titus iii. 5, in which the idea of regeneration is connected with baptism, though the necessity and reality of a new birth are often set forth.

And this brings us to a consideration of the phrase lexically. What have we to help us to interpret the phrase, "born of water," and to justify our understanding that it is equivalent to "born of the flesh," or natural birth.

1. When it is said that there is no *usus loquendi* for the phrase "born of water," as meaning natural birth, it may be retorted that there is as little for the phrase as signifying spiritual birth. The most that either interpretation can claim is Scriptural allusions from which it is possible to deduce the preferred meaning. And then we say that the allusions to natural birth or descent are more readily found than those which refer to spiritual birth. It is admitted at once that there is no *usus* at all in Greek literature. But, in Hebrew, allusions are found which fairly furnish a basis for this phrase, which is altogether peculiar to the Hebraic John, and which was spoken within a purely Jewish circle, that would understand the reference—Jesus, Nicodemus and John.

2. The phrase "born of the flesh," as indicating simply human birth, without emphasizing or even implying "carnal and corrupt nature," is not unscriptural. Paul makes a similar use of the idea in his distinction between "the children of the flesh" and "the children of promise" in Rom. ix; and in the same chapter he speaks of our Lord's descent from the Israelites "according to the flesh." In neither of these cases does the taint of evil and positive unworthiness cling to the word "flesh." Yet in neither case would participation in the kingdom of God rest upon the claim of mere physical connection. Precisely what the Lord here says to Nicodemus.

3. There are analogical expressions in the Scriptures which warrant the given interpretation. The allusions to water in connection with life, becoming, generation, growth—that is, with existence in various spheres—are not few in Scripture. The references in Gen. i. 20, 21, and 2 Pet. iii. 5, prove that the connection between water and the origin of physical life was a Hebraic conception, and water in the sense of fluid became a term for life, birth, descent. It is necessary now to

quote, as samples of such allusions, only such passages as Isa. xlviii. 1: "Hear ye this, O house of Jacob, who are called by the name of Israel and are come forth out of *the waters* of Judah (מִמֵּי יְהוּדָה)." Ps. lxxviii. 27 (26) "Bless ye God; ye that are of *the fountain* of Israel (מִמְקוֹר יִשְׂרָאֵל)" (lxx. 'Ex πηγῶν Ἰσραὴλ). Numb. xxiv. 7. "He shall pour the waters out of his buckets, and his seed shall be in many waters;" a prophecy of a numerous progeny. Physiological facts, both in conception and at birth, justify the use of such metaphors, and warrant the expression to beget or to be born of water. Cf. Job x. 10.

What I have to say, especially from this point, is said with diffidence, but with the modest conviction that it rests on a Scriptural basis. I would fain hope that a larger erudition and a better opportunity for investigation than lie within my reach, will, in the main, confirm the positions here taken.

The two words, blood and water, have in all languages an important bearing on the question of origin of life. In Greek, and among all western nations, the physical connection in the transmission of life is placed in the blood. From Homer down, to be of blood (δαίμαρος εἶναι), or of one blood, meant to be of the same race. To be of noble blood means to be of renowned descent. This usage is also found in the New Testament. Paul, speaking to Greeks at Athens, says: "God has made of one blood all the nations." Acts xvii. 26. But this use of blood is strange to the Hebrews and to the Old Testament, where blood, as the symbol of life, or the seat of life, is never used with the idea of its transmittal or preservation, but only with its destruction. From Gen. iv. where Abel's blood cries from the ground, to Zech. ix. where the covenant of deliverance is sealed in blood, blood stands for death—the loss of life. The idea of being born of blood—so familiar in our tongue—is unknown to the Hebrews. Ezek. xvi. 2, and xix. 10 are no exceptions to this statement.

On the other hand, the Hebrews had a conception of the connection between water and transmitted life, which is unusual

among western peoples. The traces of this are abundant in the Old Testament. The Hebrews had one consistent, admitted cosmogony. The other nations had various theories as the result of speculation or study. In the imagery of the Mosaic cosmogony, the earth is in the womb of the waters, upon which the vivifying spirit broods with life-evoking power. Thence all things are born out of water (*ἐξ ὕδατος*). When the firmament is set, it is represented as the dividing element between waters above and waters beneath, waters having the potency of life production, so that the world above us and that beneath is a world of life, and nowhere of death. The gathering of the lower waters into the sea is followed by the production of plant-life, represented as a going out (*צָמַח*), a word also frequently used for human birth, and a springing forth (*נִפְּץ*) from their place of begetting. On the fifth day the waters above give birth to the flying creatures, and the waters below to swimming creatures, represented as creeping forth out of the waters (*צָמַח*). From this on, throughout the Old Testament, the connection of water with the production and increase of life in the material creation is abundantly mentioned. See the beautiful picture in Ps. lxxv. and the frequent use in the book of Job for examples. In John's writings no figure is more frequent than that of the water of life—life-giving water.

How uniformly this conception of the Mosaic cosmogony prevailed among the Jews is plain from the reference to it in 2 Pet. iii. 5.

With such views of the origin of so much of natural life, it is not strange that water should serve them also as a symbol for human life in its origin. We know how realistic the Hebrew language is and what bold metaphors are in its common words. One needs but suggest the terms for man and woman in Gen. i. 27, and for son in Gen. iv. 17, as examples. Hence we have the metaphors: fountain, spring, well, for wife in Cant. iv. 12-15; Prov. v. 15, 16, 18; for offspring in Prov. v. 16 and Hosea xiii. 15; and for genealogical descent in Ps. lxxviii. 27. The Greeks never used *πηγή* or its equivalents in that way.

But we can go a step farther, since we have even the more realistic representation of water as the metaphor for offspring and descent in Numb. xxiv. 7 and Isa. xlviii. 1, as already noted.

Now it cannot indeed be proved from this that the Jews ordinarily used these metaphors, or that the phrase "born of water" was a *current* phrase for natural birth, but it is sufficient proof for the assertion that an allusion with this signification would not be altogether strange to Nicodemus or any Jew, or that the phrase would be altogether unintelligible to him. And when we compare it with the evidence available to prove that a new birth through baptism was a current idea among the Jews at the time of this conversation, I think the case must be decided in favor of the interpretation, natural birth.

If, indeed, the fourth gospel had been written in the second century; and *if* the writer had produced these conversations and words of the Lord from his own subjectivity; or *if* the apostle John, writing this gospel, had adopted in his old age the sacramentarian views which so soon prevailed in the Christian Church, to the great detriment of the truth, and in defiance of the warnings and teachings of Paul; and *if* John had allowed his opinions to color his reproduction of the Lord's words: then the traditional interpretation of this phrase might be admitted. But the Christian Church will never consent to accept these suppositions.

The Reformed view that water here is equivalent to spirit would be more acceptable were it not for these reasons: 1. The use of the figure hendiadys in the New Testament is very doubtful. 2. Things that can be explained rationally should not be sacrificed to a rhetorical demand. 3. It is difficult to see a satisfactory reason for the use of two words, where one would better answer the purpose. To describe regeneration, it is enough to say, except a man be born of the Spirit, unless this, indeed, depends on water, which we deny. 4. Because of the bearing of this passage on other difficult passages in John's writings, with which it must in justice be compared if we wish to get a true exegesis.

Of these passages we have two:

1. John i. 13: "Begotten or born of blood" (*ἐκ αἱμάτων γεννηθῆναι*). There is no question that this phrase means begotten of (out of) blood and refers to natural generation. This is according to Greek usage rather than Hebrew. It is contrasted with "begotten of God" (*ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηθῆναι*) in the same verse, an expression peculiar to and frequently used by John.

In comparing our passage with this, it does not seem to me that to be begotten or born of God and to be born or begotten of the Spirit, as the words may be rendered, are exactly equivalent. I prefer to render always, as the Revisers have also done, begotten of God and born of the Spirit; and would find an analogous difference in the spiritual experiences thus indicated. The Holy Spirit is represented in the Scriptures rather as the essential sphere in regeneration than as the primary agent. Hence the proper designation of the regenerate is children (*τέκνα*) of God, never of the Spirit, though we become children of God by being born of the Spirit. A somewhat similar difference in the ideas begotten of blood and born of water, as applied to natural birth, seems to me justified; representing or expressing what may be called the active and passive principles in life-giving, and making room for distinctions, which, through their application to the reception of spiritual life, may be very instructive and comforting. Reverence and a sense of our limitations forbid saying too much about these mysteries of being. Still there are the revelations—to profit withal—of God's immediate power through and in the Spirit by the Word as an incorruptible seed, which seed remains in us so that we cannot sin, because we are begotten of God. (Cf. Rom. viii.; Gal. iii.; 1 John iv. 13; Jas. i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 23; 1 Jno. iii. 9; v. 18, etc.) Of it we are privileged to say that through it we have received the life of God and have become partakers of the divine nature (Eph. iv. 18; 2 Pet. i. 4). This also covers the whole ground. The "*element*" in water, of which the Fathers made so much use, is entirely a misconception of the real meaning of the Sacrament of Baptism.

2. In 1 John v. 6, 7, we have a still more important and difficult passage to compare with the one in hand. "This is He, who came through ($\delta\iota$) water and blood, Jesus Christ; not by ($\epsilon\iota$) the water only, but by ($\epsilon\iota$) the water and by ($\epsilon\iota$) the blood: and the Spirit is the testifier, because the Spirit is the truth. For three are the testifiers—active, not passive witnesses—the Spirit, and the water, and the blood, and these three are unto the one, that is, for the establishing of the one same thing."

There are many interpretations of this obscure passage, but the most generally accepted are these three. "Water and blood" signify: 1. The two sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. 2. The baptism and the death of Jesus. 3. The water and blood which issued from the riven side of our Lord on the cross. None of these seems satisfactory, and there is no prospect that the Christian church will agree in adopting any one of them as conclusive. Nor can we wonder at that. Let any one substitute the explanations for the terms used in the text, and he will feel that somehow the text is no longer what it was. Thus: This is He who came by or in the sacraments of Baptism and the Supper, Jesus Christ, and so on; or, This is He, who came by or in His own baptism and His death, and so on; or, This is He who came by and in the water and blood that flowed from His side, and so forth. I think we cannot but feel that all these interpretations are determined by previous considerations. No one of them does justice to the important word which is the key of the passage. "He that came." We must look in the words in dispute for events which were in some sense worthy and true *avenues* of the coming of Jesus as the Christ. Let us very briefly examine the passage.

The purpose of the epistle, in which these words occur, is to set forth fully the word of life—that is, the person of Jesus Christ, and His bearings upon the believers in their various relations towards God, towards one another, and towards the world, both the present world and that which is to come. In

this the essential thing is the knowledge that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and especially with a view to the special error to be combated, that *He came in the flesh*. See ch. iv. 2; v. 1; (cf. ii. 22; iii. 23; iv. 3, 15). The true knowledge of Jesus as the Christ is the great proof of the new life of God, and to him who has it the victory over the world is assured. Ch. v. 4, 5. In view, then, of the exceeding importance of this knowledge, what witnesses have we for all time that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, who came in the flesh? That is the question which is answered in vs. 6-8. Here is the setting forth of the testimonies on behalf of Jesus the Christ. Now the witnesses must cover these three points: that Jesus is the Son of God, that He is the Christ, that He came in the flesh. The Apostle says there are three testifiers to these facts: the Spirit, the water, the blood—they are permanent witnesses. They bore testimony all through the manifestation of Jesus as the Christ from the beginning and will continue to bear it forever. They agree in their testimony. Each one bears witness to the three facts, although in each a different fact is most prominent, and so they establish the one same thing. Their testimony must be historical testimony, for this manifestation of the Christ is in history and it must cover the ground. Now the historical testimony concerning Jesus the Christ can, from a scriptural point of view, not be found in the sacraments, themselves, for these are not original testimonies, but must be found in the record to which the sacraments are attached as seals of confirmation for believers. That record begins not at the Lord's baptism, but at His birth. In it are three great points: the birth, which was His coming in the flesh; the death, which was the completion of His life in the flesh and the full revelation of the Christ; the descent of the Spirit upon Him at the beginning of His active ministry, which was the standing sign that He was the well-beloved Son of God. This bestowal of the Spirit coincided indeed with His baptism, but it was no essential part of the baptism. The baptism itself was no witness that He was the Christ. The Lord's request for it disconcerted John. To

be baptized with John's baptism of repentance was an incident of the life in the flesh. It was part of the Lord's mediatorial humiliation, by which He proved in how profound and true a sense He was one with us, sinful men, whom He was not ashamed to call brethren on Jordan's bank, where they gathered as sinners, as penitent sinners, publicans, harlots, soldiers and the like, thus fulfilling all possible demands of righteousness in that world of sin which He came to redeem. There John learned not only that He was the Son of God, but also the Lamb of God, that beareth the sins of the world. No wonder the forerunner exclaimed again and again, "And I knew Him not! I did not understand Him!" The Father, whose well-beloved Son He still was, glorified Him in that very low experience, as the Son of God, and the Spirit came upon Him as the standing proof of His Sonship.*

These, then, are the testifiers: The incarnation, the dying, the descent of the Spirit. The natural birth testifies that He is a man, born of a woman; that He is Christ, as supernaturally born; that He is the Son of God, for so He was announced in the prophecy of His birth. The death testifies that He is a man, that He died as the Christ, and was accompanied by testimony that He was the Son of God. The descent of the Spirit testifies that He was the Son of God and was given Him as a man because He was the Christ. So they agree in their witness.

If this conception of the Lord's experiences be right, coming through water or in water would here also mean coming in the flesh, and it harmonizes with born of water as a synonym for human birth and thus confirms our interpretation of John iii. 5.

It strengthens our view if we remember that the term "coming one" or "he that came" refers to the appearance of Jesus as the Christ in many places. Thus the Baptist sent his disciples to Jesus to ask: "Art thou the Coming One?" (*ὁ ἐρχόμενος*) The Baptist had so announced Him. So the multitudes hailed

*This baptism to which our Lord submitted is never referred to in the Epistles as of any special value. Our baptism is not linked to it, but to His circumcision. Col. ii. : 12.

Him at his entrance into Jerusalem: "Blessed is the Coming One in the Name of Jehovah." It is used with special frequency in the writings of John. See John iii. 2; iv. 25; v. 43; vi. 14; vii. 27, 28, 42; ix. 39; x. 10; xi. 27; 1 John iv. 2, 3; 2 John 7. If one will look at these passages it will appear that in no proper sense consistent with their meaning did Jesus come as the Christ through the baptism which He received from John; nor, of course, through Christian Baptism, instituted after His resurrection; nor through the water poured out from His ruptured heart, which was but the sign of His physical dissolution. Before any and all of these occurrences, He had already come, according to the word of the Angels to the shepherds: "This day there is born to you in the city of David a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord," Luke ii. 10.

From the standing testimonies concerning Jesus as the Christ, the birth—the moment of the Incarnation—could not possibly have been omitted. It never can be. "To us a child is *born*,"—born as we are, of water, though not like us begotten of blood, and that is the first, the essential proof that "to us a *Son* is given, whose name is Wonderful" (Isaiah ix. 6). "He is the Antichrist that denieth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," 1 John iv. 3. (*ἐν σαρκί* or *ἐν τῷ ὕδατι*).

In conclusion: Much confusion in the understanding of the sacrament of Baptism as a symbolic act can be avoided, if men will first get correct ideas of the symbolic meaning of water as used in the sacrament. Water in a good sense, serves in Scripture as a symbol for three things:

1. As a symbol of Truth, that which revives, comforts, satisfies the soul of man. When so used it is connected with verbs which express an act of inwardly appropriating, like drinking; so that the truth enters into the heart and life of man. Isaiah lv. 1 and John iv. 10-14 will serve as examples. This is not the meaning of water in Baptism, for there the water is outwardly applied.

2. As a symbol of a cleansing force or for the blood of Christ, itself a metaphor for the whole redemption wrought out by

Christ, and presented to sinners, first of all as a cleansing process, the remission of sins. (Romans iii. 25; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14-24, etc.) When so used it is joined with sprinkling, washing, and similar ceremonial acts in the Old Testament and with baptizing in the New Testament. Of numerous instances let the following serve as examples: Numbers viii. 6, 7; Ezek. xxxvi. 25 (cf. with Heb. x. 22) For the blood of Christ as a cleansing element, see 1 John i. 7; Rev. i. 5 (Text. Rec.); 1 Peter i. 2; Acts xxii. 16; Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5. In Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27, we have the accompanying blessings of this cleansing under the new Covenant, the new heart and the new spirit, —truly a new life, coming in order after the cleansing from filth and guilt.

3. As a symbol for life—new life. Then it is connected with words which express processes of life, like becoming, birth, growth, and it is generally represented as a stream, a life-giving river. See Ezek. xlvii. 9, 12. Or it is represented as showers of rain which vivify and cause to grow. See Isaiah xxxii. 15.

Now, if baptism be symbolic of spiritual blessings and of the communication of spiritual life, it must be in consonance with such promises. In them, however, there is no explicit promise of a new life, such as is implied in the theological term "regeneration." The symbolic signification of baptism as the sign and seal of regeneration rests entirely upon John iii. 5 and Titus iii. 5,—*λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας*—an expression not occurring elsewhere. Now, if we grant the application to regeneration, there can be no propriety in using baptism as a symbol of spiritual birth, unless water properly represents natural birth.

But if this be so, there can be no successful denial of the assertion that the phrase "born of water" may mean natural birth. Whether it does or not, the whole passage must show. We are ready to admit that the water in baptism symbolizes a new birth, but only because water is a proper symbol for natural birth in John iii. 5. To make water-birth to mean regeneration, or to use baptism as in any real sense an essential part

of regeneration, we hold to be subversive of the gospel. The experience of the Christian Church from quite early ages, in which this erroneous interpretation was adopted, is ample proof to this effect. The salvation of the soul is, in no sense, dependent on any outward ceremony. Salvation is by faith. The one object of faith is the word of the gospel of God's grace. Sacraments are subordinate to the Word, and only representations of the Word under well-defined limitations and for special purposes. They are not substitutes for the Word, nor is their reception a substitute in any sense for faith. We may well say of our own sacrament of baptism, as Paul said of the sacrament of circumcision in Gal. vi. 15, 16: "For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation (is everything). And as many as walk by this rule (not dependent on a sacrament), peace (shall be) upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God."

V.

EVOLUTION AND THE OLD FAITH.*

BY REV. J. B. RUST, A.M.

HERE and there—for the drift in the direction of Elmslerian theology on the part of the clergy is by no means so widespread as some would have us believe—ministers of the gospel are heard of and met with who adopt what they claim to be a purer system of faith. These advocates of a new Christianity kneel at the shrine of science, the science of Darwin, Huxley and Spencer, and digging up the rationalistic teachings of Baur, Strauss and Renan, graft them upon the tree of evolution. Suddenly it has been discovered that the principle of evolution is true—true beyond the shadow of an exception—and therefore, we are told, the theories of Baur, Strauss and Renan in the sphere of New Testament criticism surely were buried alive, are not dead, possess the very elements of truth and must be set free again that the crude theological notions of the religion of our day, both Protestant and Catholic, may cease to darken the mental vision and enchain the emotional nature of civilized nations. No one doubts the learning, ability and critical acumen of the rationalistic schools of Germany, nor can any one deny that Darwin has contributed vast stores of knowledge to natural science, that Huxley is a remarkably gifted defender of the agnostic position peculiar to him, and that Herbert Spencer may command the respect of mankind for the one great fact, if for no other, that, by the aid of an acute intellect and unflagging patience, he has applied the

*The Evolution of Man and Christianity. By the Rev. Howard MacQuerry. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

theory of evolution to every branch of research. It was a prodigious undertaking, for but few men in the history of philosophy have succeeded in so completely working out a system of thought to the minutest detail. But it is a bold thing to say, and a still bolder to act upon the declaration, that these men must be heard as the great advance guard and leading prophets of a purified and higher form of religious faith. There is more or less truth in every system of thought, as there certainly is in every form of religion—Pagan and Christian. We should not—we cannot condemn every phase of the theory of evolution. "No such theory"—or phase of it—"clashes with the fundamental ideas of the Bible as long as it is not denied that there is a human species, and that man is distinguished from the lower animals by attributes which we know that he possesses. Whether the first of human kind were created outright, or, as the second narrative in Genesis represents it, were formed out of inorganic material, out of the dust of the ground, or were generated by inferior organized beings, through a metamorphosis of germs, or some other process—these questions, as they are indifferent to theism, so they are indifferent as regards the substance of biblical teaching. It is only when, in the name of science, the attempt is made to smuggle in a materialistic philosophy, that the essential ideas of the Bible are contradicted."** So says Dr. Fisher, of Yale, one of those Calvinistic teachers whose theology is in certain quarters described as crude and stupid. But the rector of St. Paul's, with good reason, seeing that in his chapter on the idea of God he has fortified himself against it, would at once repudiate the charge of materialism. He is not a materialist. How could one who claims to see efficacy and possible reality in Christian Science and Modern Spiritualism be a materialist? And yet we cannot understand what logical connection there exists between Berkeleyian Idealism set forth in the first portion of this new book and the rationalistic teaching based upon Baur, Strauss and Renan developed in the second half of the work. Strauss,

* Fisher, *The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, p. 478.

to whose "Life of Christ" the author so often appeals, died an out-spoken and unqualified materialist. And in the outstart both Baur and Strauss were Hegelian pantheists. To a careful reader of this book, it becomes more and more evident that its author in its preparation allowed himself to be wholly governed by an arbitrary logic of pre-conception whose presentation in lecture and sermonie form from the pulpit, and final publication in book-form he seeks to justify by an unwarranted interpretation of the Sixth of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, an interpretation so liberal that the original conception is wholly lost. Did the Divines who formulated the Thirty-nine Articles so understand the Sixth? Did any one in or near the time of their adoption so conceive its meaning? John Milton, perhaps the keenest intellect of his age, and far in advance of the people for whom he wrote, said: "With good religious reason, therefore, all Protestant Churches with one consent—and particularly the Church of England in her Thirty-nine Articles, article 6th, 19th, 20th, 21st, and elsewhere—maintained these two points as the main principles of true religion—that the rule of true religion is the word of God only, and that their faith ought not to be an implicit faith—that is, to believe, though as the Church believes, against or without express authority of Scripture." * Thus we see that if the essentials of the Christian faith no longer rest upon the authority of Scripture, since, according to our author, the whole fabric is doubtful as to origin, the self-defensive interpretation of the Sixth article, as made in the preface, is not only uncalled for, but the article itself becomes useless.

For a number of years the rector of St. Paul's has been an ardent advocate of Berkeleyian Idealism. But this system of philosophy, beautiful as it is in many respects, "cannot account for the alterations in psychological conditions—for example, of waking, sleeping and dreaming; nor explain the difference between mere imaginings and the conceptions of objects actually present, between accidental and necessary conceptions, or how the emo-

* Milton, *Prose Works*, p. 401.

tions of pain and regret arise." In view of this fact, what philosophical foundation is there for the visionary theory of Keim advocated by our author. How may we *know* that the resurrection of Jesus was phenomenal or real, subjective or objective? Again, "The system of Berkeley is incompatible with human freedom. As freedom can never exert itself without ideas, and God begets all ideas which relate to external objects, human action must always be under determinism." Thus our friend, the respected author, in rejecting the Calvinistic theology as crude and effete on the one hand, and on the other in advocating Berkeleyian Idealism with so much *éclat*, strained at a gnat and swallowed a camel.

Turning to the doctrine of evolution in the unqualified form in which our author presents it, as the final philosophy underlying all facts, all life, all history, the question suggests itself whether the premises from which he draws his conclusions can lay claim to demonstration. If they do not, the fabric falls and only the remnants of truth incorporated into it will remain. He says (p. 69): "I accept the evolution of man, body and soul, from the lower animals." We ask whether the "grateful" acceptance of the "deliveries" of Spencer and Romanes "on these subjects," and a readjustment of "our theology accordingly," whilst we wait for a further discovery of "all the laws and causes of evolution" would be a scientific procedure? That our author accepts all these gratuitous conclusions without absolute demonstration surely cannot be held to be a sufficient reason for a radical reconstruction of the very essentials of the Christian faith. We might point out other paragraphs in which this method is followed, passages in which the author identifies personal opinion and private conclusions with demonstration, and asks his readers for this reason, on such grounds, to become disciples of his doctrine. In addition he exhorts them to pass through a course of reading, to study a certain line of works, which process he seems to firmly believe will result in the adoption of his positions—his interpretation of the Sixth article, Berkeleyian Idealism and certain conclusions of German ra-

tionalists of fifty years ago. But he is not always consistent. For example, in the chapter on the Divinity of Christ (p. 287) it is said: "After having mastered the evolutionary argument the student should then read such books as Dr. Ullman's 'Sinlessness of Jesus,' etc." But this celebrated treatise on the Person of Christ contains no such theory of the incarnation, "the union of the Spirit of Jesus with the Divine Spirit," as set forth by our author, "which union constitutes what *I* at least understand by the Divinity of Jesus Christ." Dr. Ullmann says (p. 104): "Who in our day thinks of seeking for the sources of Christianity in Essenism or the wisdom of the Egyptian priests? Who attempts to represent Jesus as standing midway between Phariseeism and Sadduceeism? Or to whom could the thought suggest itself that He chose any figure of the Old Testament, Abraham, Moses, Elias, as His prototype? No, if ever there has appeared an original, an absolutely creative personality in the spiritual and moral realm, it is the Person, the Character of Christ."

We freely acknowledge that in the past many erroneous opinions have been held by the professed followers of Christ. Certain shades of the teachings of the churches touching the idea of God, Revelation, Inspiration, Miracles, the Atonement, etc., have not been and are not consonant with sound reason nor with the facts of history and Scripture. Then, too, more weight than is really necessary and justifiable has been laid upon doctrine, whilst life and conduct received too little attention. Truth wrought into the souls of men in the form of deep and unshaken convictions as to the objects of faith will ever remain one of the leading elements of religion and pious devotion. But without the imitation of the example of Christ, the doing of the will of God, the observance of the principles of honesty, virtue and love between man and man, in the spirit of self-sacrifice, Christian profession is incomplete. All this our author, with much energy, points out and maintains. But, nevertheless, in attacking many of the very essentials of the Christian faith, without which it would cease to be Christianity,

and offering in their stead a set of teachings based upon the "deliveries" of scientists and rationalists, he falls into the very error he claims to see and scourge in others. He says (p. 287): "Of course, this is the barest skeleton of the view of the Incarnation which we (evolutionists) hold, and it is earnestly hoped that the reader will accept it as such and try to clothe it with flesh and blood." In other words, our author, in his work, gives the "barest skeleton" of the Berkeleyian philosophy, of evolution as manifested throughout the realm of matter and mind, as applied to the criticism of the canon of Scripture and the commonly accepted teachings of the Church, "which we (evolutionists) hold," and "earnestly" hopes that all this may be accepted by the reader and "clothed with flesh and blood." If more depends upon the manner of life than upon the doctrinal positions; if "the ecclesiastical anathema" is to descend, not upon "views held," but upon "life led," what possible necessity can there be for urging the introduction of a revolution, a radical alteration of the essentials of the old faith, when the old faith, with all its imperfection and inadequacies, its anthropomorphism, its intricate genealogical appendages, its Bishop Usher chronology, has in the past yielded so much good fruit, and even now promises far more spiritual comfort than the "new" religion with its scientific "deliveries!" It does not lie within the power of man thus to construct a religion. Facts are not the only substance and substratum of faith. If they were, in what a maze the nations of the earth would find themselves! Facts will prove anything. "You may have your Hegel's 'Philosophy of History,' or you may have your Schlegel's 'Philosophy of History,' you may prove from history that the world is governed in detail by a special Providence; you may prove that there is no sign of any moral agent in the universe except man; you may believe, if you like it, in the old theory of the wisdom of antiquity; you may speak, as was the fashion in the fifteenth century, of "our fathers, who had more wit and wisdom than we;" or you may talk of "our barbarian ancestors," and describe their wars

as the scuffling of kites and crows; you may maintain that the evolution of humanity has been an unbroken progress towards perfection; you may maintain that there has been no progress at all, and that man remains the same poor creature that he ever was." * Religious intuition touching the moral needs of men and the sovereignty of God in the universe, associated with the Scripture revelations, set more and more into the light of the perfect day by a positive criticism that is constructive rather than destructive, alone can save mankind from the total loss of truth and the knowledge of the living God.

* Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, p. 22.

VI.

SYMBOLISM OF EARLY CHRISTIAN ART.

BY W. ARMITAGE BEARDSLEE, B.A.

THERE seems to have existed, at least in some parts of the Early Church, a very marked antipathy against the Arts. Painting and Sculpture, especially, from their intimate connection with Pagan worship, were by many regarded as infected with idolatry. The writers of the second and third centuries are almost unanimous in their condemnation of every attempt to introduce the use of art in worship. The Church, born in the midst of Hebrew life, had inherited a Hebrew aversion to the representation of animate life; and it was only by a gradual process—a process which marked the decline of apostolic faith and a partial return to the heathen traditions—that there grew up within the Church a distinctively Christian art.

The progress of this development is marked by two stages. The first is that of Decorative Art; for even the early Christians saw no harm in relieving the barrenness of wall-spaces by the use of the simpler forms of decoration commonly employed throughout the Roman world at that time. Some of these mural paintings, found in the Catacombs of Rome, are possibly as old as the time of the Emperor Titus. They consist of the simplest designs, such as geometrical figures, vines supported by trellis work, and occasionally the figures of birds and animals.

From a decorative art such as this it was an easy step to an Art of Symbolism. The vine, winding its graceful branches about a chapel wall, reminded those who saw it of Him who said: "I am the Vine, and my Father is the Husbandman."

The bird, resting in its branches, became a dove, and the mind was directed to that Holy Spirit who, in the form of a Dove, descended from heaven at the baptism of Christ in Jordan. Other simple designs and emblems were introduced, and Symbolic Art, from being the exception, soon became the rule.

The old aversion to the historic presentation of events was still maintained. There was no attempt to paint the portrait of the Saviour, no realistic drawing of the scenes from His life, no endeavor to picture forth the Holy Trinity or the Final Judgment; yet, in one way or another, these ideas all found expression in the symbols of Early Christian Art.

The employment of symbols in the expression of religious truth was no innovation of the Early Church. In nearly all the ancient religions Symbolism, or the method of presenting ideas and describing events not by exact and literal statement or the historic presentation of them, but by the use of constituted signs or emblems which had a definite and uniform significance, was well-known and in common use. There existed in them all a system of picture-writing which appealed to the imagination and kept alive to those who thought the few germs of truth which had been scattered broadcast over the earth.

Hermes Trismegistus, it is said, taught that God was a circle whose centre was everywhere and whose circumference was nowhere. The doctrine is vague, but too valuable to be lost; and the circle becomes the symbol of Deity, used by all the ancient world and found to-day in almost every Christian Church, reminding all who regard it of Him Who has neither beginning nor end, Who is absolutely perfect, and Who cannot be measured; for the circle has never been squared.

The symbols of Christian Art are found frescoed or carved on the walls of the Catacombs from the first century onwards, in the earliest ecclesiastical mosaics and paintings, and in the entire literature of the Ancient Christian Church. Later this symbolic art was employed in the illumination of books of devotion and in the stained windows of churches, where it is principally found to-day. Christian Art has grown out of Christian Sym-

bolism, and some knowledge of the meaning of the symbols is essential to a correct understanding of the hymns, the sermons, the vestments, the rites and ceremonies, the paintings, the architecture of the whole Christian Church before the Reformation.

After the Reformation a large part of the ecclesiastical symbolism—that which had grown up with Mariolatry and the Worship of the Saints—was discarded in Protestant lands, though nearly all the earlier and more scriptural was still retained.

It is only of the earlier Symbolism that I shall speak in this paper, attempting to show in order how some of the great truths of Revelation were presented in pictorial language. "Pictures are poor men's books," said St. John of Damascus; and by a study of these signs and emblems so universally used by the Early Church, we shall perhaps be brought nearer the actual Christian life and the realistic faith of that simpler age than we should by a critical examination of its doctrinal creeds and standards.

GOD THE FATHER.

In the Catacombs the Father is symbolized by a Hand, which is the only emblem used for that purpose. The hand was regarded by the Jews as the symbol of creative and authoritative power. It is of very frequent occurrence in the earliest Christian Art. In frescoes of the Giving of the Law to Moses, the Hand is seen extended from a cloud, reaching down the tables of stone. In the Sacrifice of Isaac it appears restraining the uplifted knife of Abraham. In all the Saviour's acts as represented in frescoes and paintings, the Divine Hand is seen, symbol of the Father's Presence to bless and strengthen. "When at the crucifixion Jesus, in the agony of death, calls on the Father in those despairing words: 'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' we discover traced upon the summit of the Cross a Hand—the Hand of the Father in the act of benediction." * This, however, is from a later period. In

* Didron, "Christ. Icon.," p. 207.

the earliest examples the Hand is unadorned; soon a glory radiates from it expressive of the grace and favor of God; then appear in succession, as the Darker Ages came, the arm, the head, the bust, and finally the whole Person of the Father, and the symbol is neglected in the unfortunate attempt to picture Him Whom no man hath seen at any time.

GOD THE SON.

Of all the many symbols of the Son of God, the most favored both in literature and art was that of the Good Shepherd.* Crook in hand, He is pictured on the ceilings of ancient chapels, on the wall-spaces of the Catacombs, on marble sarcophagi and on the Eucharistic calice as the Shepherd who is always youthful, beardless, clad in a short tunic, and often with an Orphean lyre; while on His shoulders is always seen the lamb—the one lost lamb, now found—the object of the gentle Shepherd's care. It is a beautiful symbol, and was deeply loved by the early Church.

During the earlier centuries the priestly character of Jesus was universally symbolized by the sacrificial Lamb. The Old Testament type became the New Testament symbol. John the Baptist had announced our Saviour as the Lamb of God, and so He was called in the *Gloria in Excelsis*, which unquestionably belongs to the second century. This symbol still retains its position in Christian Art, though, curiously enough, there has existed, at various times in the history of the Church an opposition to the exclusive use of this emblem of the Saviour from fear that the ignorant might conceive that Christ had actually dwelt incarnate among men in the form of a Lamb. The Synod of Trullo (Constantinople, A.D. 692) decreed, therefore, that henceforth He should be presented in His human form, though the canon was disregarded in the East and rejected in the West. Later on, in the thirteenth century, an interesting compromise was brought about. It was decided that Christ on the cross should be depicted as a man, "though

* S. John x. 11.

there is no let," the writing runs, "when Christ hath been represented as a Man, to paint a Lamb on an inferior part of the cross, or on the reverse, since He is indeed the true Lamb that beareth the sins of the world." *

To this symbol should probably be traced the genesis of the Crucifix. In the earliest art the lamb and the cross are frequent, but separate. Soon, however, they are found in conjunction, the lamb on an altar over which there is a cross, or else reposing at the foot of the cross. The next step was the substitution of the human form for that of the lamb. Thus far in its development no traces of suffering are observable, and the Body of Jesus is enveloped in a long loose robe. But towards the tenth or eleventh centuries the times were gloomy and men were stern, and then the pain and agony of the dying Christ were first depicted.

The Fish is also one of the oldest symbols of Christ. Scratched on Christian monuments of the earliest period are often found the Greek letters *ΙΧΘΥC*. No heathen could possibly have guessed their significance, but to every Christian eye they were a confession of faith. Each letter stands for a word and the five words of the anagram are these:

ΙΗCΟΥC ΧΡΙCΤΟC ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟC CΩΤΗΡ.

"Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Saviour." But more frequently than by the word was the confession painted under the form of a fish, generally a carp or a dolphin.†

The Fish is sometimes found in modern Christian Art, generally significant of the believer who has been drawn out of the sea of sin by the fishers of men or the net of the Church. This use of the symbol is also as old as Christian Art itself.‡

* Durandus, *Rat. Div. Off. lib. I., cap. 3.*

† v. Lundy, *Mon. Christ.*, p. 133.

‡ As in Clement's Hymn to the Logos, cir. A.D. 190.

"Fisher of men, whom Thou to life doth bring

From evil sea of sin

And from the billowy strife,

Gathering pure fishes in."

—Am. Ed. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. II., p. 296.

Perhaps the most frequent of all the symbols of Christ is the Monogram. The meaning attached to this sign, as is generally known, is derived from its being a combination of the two Greek letters, *XP*, the beginning of the word *XPIOTOS*. It is found everywhere—on tombs, on lamps, on signet-rings, on books, and even at the present time in the stained windows and on the furnishings of almost every Church in Christendom.

Connected with this is the simple cross as the symbol of Him who had died upon it.

There are also other symbols which suggested to the early Christians the thought of the Saviour, as the Vine and the Lion; Orpheus with his lyre, and several of the Old Testament characters, as Daniel in the Lions' Den and Moses drawing from the desert rock a flood of water to sustain the people of God.

GOD THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The Holy Spirit is most generally symbolized by a Dove. It was the Dove that brought the olive leaf to Noah. It was the Dove that was present at the Baptism of Christ, and a more appropriate symbol could hardly have been found. It is seen in almost every picture in the Catacombs. Wherever the artist wished to show the Presence of the Holy Spirit he drew a Dove. It is always found in scenes of Baptism, of Ordination, by the side of the Good Shepherd and at the helm of the ship which symbolizes the Church.

THE HOLY TRINITY.

The doctrine of the Trinity, whatever may have been its place in the symbolism of a later time, has found a most meagre expression in the earliest remains of Christian Art. It is doubtful whether there can be found on any of the monuments of the first two centuries a single trace of a symbol of the Three-Fold Unity of God.

The Three Persons are represented in one painting, as frequently in pictures of Christ's Baptism, by combining the symbol of the Father—the Hand extended from a cloud; the symbol of the Son—the Young Man with beardless face, manifestly no attempt at a portrait; and the symbol of the Holy Spirit—the pure white Dove. It has been conjectured that the Trident with its three points blending into one rod may symbolize the Trinity. This has been found in the Catacombs, and also the Triangle, but in Catacombs of later date.

After the great Ecumenical Councils, when the dogmas of the Church had crystallized into form, the favorite emblem of Trinity in Unity was a triangle circumscribed by a circle, and this was often constructed after the most elaborate fashion.

THE CHURCH.

The Church is symbolized sometimes by a ship, sometimes by a Car or Chariot, sometimes by an Ark, sometimes by a Net; but most frequently by a Virgin, or the Bride of Christ. Generally this Virgin is frescoed as an *Orante* or praying figure, both arms extended in earnest supplication. Sometimes she appears holding in her garment a number of wafers or small loaves of bread, each marked with the Greek cross, symbolic of the Bread of Life with which the Church, the Mother of Souls, feeds her children. At other times the right hand is extended in benediction; and in some pictures she is seen standing at the side of the Good Shepherd as His Bride, while at her feet the lily grows—symbol of her purity.

THE SACRAMENTS—BAPTISM.

The sacraments furnish the subjects of many of the frescoes and paintings of the earlier periods of Christian art.

Baptism was regarded as of the utmost importance. Those solemn words of our Lord, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven," were literally interpreted and firmly believed. The Passage of the Red Sea and of the Jordan River, Moses striking the rock from which came forth the life-giving

water—these types of salvation through water were early converted by frequent use to constituted symbols of the efficacy of Christian baptism. But the most usual symbol of baptism was Noah in the Ark. St. Firmilian wrote: "As they who were not in his Ark with Noah not only were not purged and saved by water, but at once perished in that deluge; so now also, whoever are not in the church with Christ will perish outside, unless they are converted by penitence to the only and saving laver of the Church."*

The representations of the Ark furnish an excellent illustration that these early frescoes were designed purely as symbols and were not in any sense attempts at historic painting. Not only is there no effort whatever to draw an ark that could hold a pair of every variety of animals, and a family of eight persons with food for all, floating upon a flood of waters that drowns the earth, but, on the contrary, the rudimentary sketch, which is almost always the same, looks far more like a man floating down stream in a tool-chest.

THE EUCHARIST.

The Holy Communion was also highly prized and was received with a very vivid sense of the real presence of Christ Himself, who is often seen blessing the loaves and fishes, symbols of the heavenly food by which the souls of the faithful are nourished. The cup and wafers are sometimes pictured; sometimes it is the sacrificial Lamb, standing on the altar, His blood flowing forth into the chalice. Most of these symbols are in use to-day, but they have in great measure lost for us the strongly realistic meaning which they evidently once conveyed.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

The dearest of all doctrines to the Primitive Christians was the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. It was in a certain sense the most distinctive of all the doctrines then proclaimed to the world. None other was so enthusiastically received. None other was so scoffed at and derided. The religious systems of the ancient world taught that the source of evil

* Epist. 75, 15.

was in matter, in the flesh, in the body; and the only escape from evil was to be found in escape from matter. This teaching was the fruitful mother of a bewildering maze of Gnostic and other speculations which sapped the life from all clear hope of a future personal existence. Opposed to this teaching came the Gospel of the Resurrection of the Body—so clear, so simple, so accredited—shining like a great light of hope amidst the surrounding darkness.

And this joyous message was proclaimed by the artists of the early church no less than by the Apostles and ministers of the word. The earliest and most frequent of the many presentations of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was the one appointed by the Lord Himself, * that of Jonah and the whale. With Him it was only a type of His own resurrection after He had been "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." But when it is referred to over and over again in the literature of the Church; when it is painted on almost every Christian tomb as in the Catacombs, and sung in every completed hymn as in the Eastern Church, it becomes more than a type—it is a constituted sign whose meaning is universally understood; it is no longer a type of Christ's resurrection only, but a symbol of resurrection in general.

As painted by the early artists there are three scenes. In the first the prophet is cast from the ship into the very mouth of leviathan, portrayed more as a great dolphin-like sea-serpent than any creature known to us. This is the Death of the Christian. In the second scene the prophet is emerging from the fish's mouth, uninjured and in sight of land. This is the Resurrection of the Christian. In the third scene the prophet is peacefully reclining under a leafy gourd-vine. This is the Rest that remaineth for the Christian.

Other frequent symbols are the Phoenix, which was taken directly from heathen mythology; the Peacock, the flesh of which was supposed, even by St. Augustine,† to be incorruptible; the Lion, whose young were supposed to have been born

* St. Matt. xii. 12-40.

† *De Civit. Dei*, lib. XXII. cap. 4.—He had himself experimented.

dead and called to life after two or three days by the roar of the mother—symbolic of the last trump! and Cupid with Psyche, possessed of eternal youth and gathering flowers in the sunny fields of Paradise.

Such are some of the symbols which the early Church employed in the pictorial expression of its Faith. Almost every idea, every hope, every doctrine, had its appropriate and suggestive emblem. The Apostles were represented by twelve sheep ranged six on either side of Christ as the Good Shepherd. The Evangelists were symbolized by four springs or streams of water gushing out of a mound on which stood the emblematic Lamb—four streams going forth to water all the earth and make it once more a Paradise for Redeemed Mankind. The Passion of our Lord was taught by the painting of the Sacrifice of Isaac; His ascension by Elijah borne to Heaven in a chariot of fire. Many others might be given, but these are enough to show how completely the ideas and faith and beliefs of the early Church expressed themselves in the symbols of early Christian art.

During the later centuries—from the seventh or eighth onwards—the number of these symbols was greatly increased, though nearly all that were added were less Scriptural and more material—symbols not only of God and the truths of His Revelation to men, but of the Saints or of Mary, Virgin Queen of Heaven.

There is one striking characteristic of early Christian art that should not remain unnoticed—its tranquillity. There are no crucifixions or martyrdoms; no hints of Pain or Death; no terrible presentations of the Last Judgment or the torments of the Lost. There is no trace of despair, or hopelessness, or discouragement. All was swallowed up in victory. All the early art breathes a spirit of restfulness and trust. The Anchor of Hope, the Crown of Rejoicing, the Palm of Triumph—these are the symbols most frequently found. Engraved or painted everywhere, these joyful emblems of their art were none the less earnest and pathetic for all their crudeness of color and mistakes in drawing.

VII.

EMERSON—THE POET.

BY CHARLES H. LERCH.

EMERSON the Poet has been the subject of most interesting discussions. Those who are the advocates of the creed Prose-poetry can find in Emerson plenty of examples to substantiate their Theory. But however poetical the prose of Emerson may be, there is a distinct department of his writings known as Poetry which would fall more particularly within the scope of the consideration, Emerson the Poet. In addition to the question whether Emerson's Poetry be Poetry or not, also another question might be asked: What is Poetry? And here we must seek not so much for a final definition, but rather for what Poetry deals in—its range. Coleridge says that "Poetry is the blossom and fragrancy of all human knowledge, human thoughts, human passions, emotions, language." According to Prof. Shairp, "Whenever the soul comes into living contact with fact and truth, whenever it realizes these with more than common vividness, there arises a thrill of joy, a glow of emotion, and the expression of that thrill, that glow, is Poetry." Or again, to express the range of Poetry according to Shairp, it "has three objects, which, in varying degrees, enter into it—Man, Nature and God." And he adds: "The presence of this last pervades all great Poetry, whether it lifts an eye of reverence directly towards Himself, or whether the Presence be only indirectly felt, as the centre to which all deep thoughts about Man and Nature ultimately tend." If this be true, then Emerson's Poetry is not only Poetry, but great Poetry, for its range is Man, Nature, God, and the Presence of God, according to Prof. Shairp, pervades his Poetry in a high degree.

Almost anywhere in his Poetry the name of God can be found, and all his Poetical conceptions, whether they be of Nature or Man, must be understood and read in the light of the Universal Mind. It is his idea, many times asserted in his Poetry, that the Poet, like

"The hand that rounded Peter's dome
Himself from God he could not free."

So thoroughly and deeply does he penetrate through the phenomena of things into the inner reality of them in his Poems, as well as in his Essays, that he becomes the mystic. Not only does he penetrate through the surface of things that externally appear the most beautiful, but he says :

" 'Tis not in the high stars alone,
Nor in the cups of budding flowers,
Nor in the red-breast's mellow tone,
Nor in the bow that smiles in showers,
But in the mud and scum of things
There alway, alway something sings."

and again he says :

" Let me go where'er I will
I hear a sky-born music still ;
It sounds from all things old,
It sounds from all things young,
From all that's fair, from all that's foul,
Peals out a cheerful song."

And so this Poetic faculty in Emerson, by which he reads so deeply into the hidden meaning of things, often makes him the intense enthusiast and guilty of what Mr. Ruskin thinks ought to be condemned by the name "Pathetic Fallacy."

Mr. Ruskin, in order to illustrate what he means by his "Pathetic Fallacy," cites two lines from Dr. Holmes :

"The spendthrift crocus, bursting through the mould
Naked and shivering, with his cup of gold."

"This," says Ruskin "is very beautiful, and yet untrue. The Crocus is not a spendthrift, but a hardy plant; its yellow is not gold, but saffron. How is it that we enjoy so much the

having it put into our heads that it is anything else than a plain crocus," and, continues he, "if we think over our favorite poetry we shall find it full of this kind of fallacy, and that we like it all the more for being so."

As an instance of Emerson's "Pathetic fallacy," Dr. Holmes cites these lines:

"Daily the bending skies solicit man,
The seasons chariot him from this exile,
The rainbow hours bedeck his glowing wheels,
The storm-winds urge the heavy weeks along,
Suns haste to set, that so remoter lights
Beckon the wanderer to his vaster home."

And this, I think, brings us back again to the point we started from, that for Emerson everything was universal Symbolism; everything—man, nature, the world—was filled with Life, the Presence of God.

But how does another object of Poetry—Man—enter into Emerson's Poetry? Remember that we were told that Poetry "has three objects, which in varying degrees enter into it—Man, nature and God." How does Emerson treat Man? I think that there is no better way of getting at the truth of the matter, how Emerson treats of Man, than by quoting a passage from one of his *Essays*. "What we commonly call man—the eating, drinking, planting, counting man—does not, as we know him, represent himself, but misrepresents himself. Him we do not respect, but the soul, whose organ he is, would he let it appear through his action, would make our knees bend." The mere natural man as he is, or as he would be when left to himself, is not the creature of Emerson's Poetry. The soul that is to make our knees bend is the Oversoul. It is the soul plus the Universal Mind. He carries out in his Poetry the idea of man, which he states in his *Essay*, "that as there is no screen or ceiling between our heads and the infinite heavens, so is there no bar or wall in the soul, where man, the effect, ceases, and God, the cause, begins." Emerson in his Poetry, as in his Prose, is in one sense a Preacher. The great Poet is also a

Preacher. The great Preacher is also a Poet. Not that we mean that the great Poet writes with a view of Preaching, but in all the best that he says about man, his transcendent destiny, his best and noblest aspirations, he becomes the Preacher.

Dr. Holmes remarks about his line :

“He builded better than he knew,”

that “the thought is constantly recurring in our literature,” and then humorously adds: “It helps out the minister’s sermon.” Emerson’s Poetry is full of lines “that would help out the minister’s sermons.”

So true is it that some of his best lines contain the highest and most suggestive thoughts about man, that Dr. Phillips Brooks with his deep interpreting power makes use of two or three passages of his Poetry to develop still further his lines of thinking on a text of Scripture. The passages to which my attention was directed for the first time by the eminent clergymen were these :

“They took this valley for their toy,
They played with it in every mood ;
A cell for prayer, a hall for joy—
They treated nature as they would.

“They colored the horizon round ;
Stars flamed and faded as they bade,
All echoes harkened for their sound—
They made the woodlands glad or mad.”

I will quote one more passage, so universally known, to illustrate Emerson’s lofty idea of Man’s highest duty :

“So nigh is grandeur to our dust,
So near is God to man,
Where Duty whispers low, *Thou must—*
The youth replies, *I can.*”

So much, then, for Emerson’s attitude towards Man. What does he teach about Nature? To understand his teaching about Nature, the critic finds himself in the same predicament as Dr. Waldstein in a recent article on Ruskin does. He says : “It is exceedingly difficult to ascertain exactly what is Ruskin’s

theory of the relation of art to nature. It would be easy to show that he holds different views at different times, continually contradicting one another. But I believe it would be fairest to him and to his work to put in simple terms what I consider his principal view, and the one most in keeping with the best he has said on other topics." This is precisely the difficulty with Emerson. At one time we are told he asserts the absolute unity of matter and mind; and he is the Pantheist. Then again he maintains freedom and uniqueness for the individual soul, and he talks like the Theist. One thing seems clear, that whatever his teaching may be in particulars in general, Nature for him was invested with Life. Among the orders which Dr. Holmes said he received, when starting out as a preacher, was this: "Nature shall be to thee as a symbol. The life of the soul, in conscious union with the Infinite, shall be for thee the only real existence." And when in his Poetry Nature seems to speak to him as though alive, we must remember that it is not the symbol, but that which is in and behind the symbol, the reality. The life of his soul corresponds and is in harmony with the Life of Nature.

The Spirit of Man is in sympathetic vibration with the Spirit of Nature. Hence Nature does not reveal herself spiritually to those who do not live in the spirit. We carry away from Shakespeare largely what we bring. Those who have no ear for music will be very much disappointed in the deepest harmonies. Sympathetic Vibration is a law of the soul as well as a law of Physics.

And so when Emerson says,

"Daily the bending skies solicit man,
The seasons chariot him from this exile,
Suns haste to set, that so remoter lights
Beckon the wanderer to his vaster home."

It seems to be the Life of Nature calling out to and beckoning, and appealing to the Life in the Soul. For the mere

materialist "The bending skies" would have no solicitations such as these. Emerson might not be able clearly to tell us what it is that solicits him in the skies. He might not be able to give us a clear definition of the Life of Nature, for he tells us in his Bohemian Hymn,

In many forms we try
To utter God's infinity,
But the boundless hath no form,
And the Universal Friend
Doth as far transcend
An angel as a worm.

The great Idea baffles wit,
Language falters under it,
It leaves the learned in the lurch ;
Nor art, nor power, nor toil can find
The measure of the eternal Mind,
Nor hymn, nor prayer, nor church.

A great deal has been said of Emerson's observations of Nature in his Poetry. That he paints things as they are. "Emerson," according to Cooke, "has been as constant an observer of nature as Tyndall or Darwin, but his method of interpretation has been that of Schelling and Wordsworth." According to Agassiz, "Emerson has a scientific method of the severest kind, and cannot be carried away by any theories."

Emerson's Poetry then "has three objects, which, in varying degrees enter into it: Man, Nature and God." And "the presence of this last pervades all" his Poetry and lifts an eye of reverence, both directly and indirectly, towards Him "as the centre to which all deep thoughts about Man and Nature ultimately tend."

And now let us, in the next place, turn to the consideration of the structure of a Poem and then to the structure of Emerson's Poem.

Every Poem is composed of two parts: invisible and visible, of a soul and a body. Every Poem first has its existence in the Mind of the Poet. In the soul of the Poet there lie, perhaps scattered, all the component parts which go to make up a

Poem. But the Poem, so far, has not yet received a body. Just as soon as the Poet gathers up the various parts, fits them and harmonizes them into each other and transfers this spiritual structure to paper, so that it there may assume a visible and tangible form, we have the soul of the Poem and the body before us. There is a close analogy between the structure of a Poem and our Physical structure in regarding them both in the light of a body and a soul. And we can classify Poets and critics of Poetry according to the views which they hold of the relation between the body and the soul of Poetry, just as we can classify men and women in the world about us according to the views they hold of the relation between the natural body and the invisible spirit. One man says, in a Poem, the body, the style, the language, the rhyme is everything. That man when he writes Poetry will constantly turn his eyes to his manner of expressing himself and will sacrifice thought to style. By studying such Poetry carefully we at once notice the Poet's conception of a Poem, just as we would at once recognize a man's notion of character-building when, after careful study of him, we found that he was sacrificing his soul to the interests of the Body. When we seek for such a Poet in the English Language, who sacrifices thought to expression, we naturally, I think, first fasten our eyes upon Pope. Mr. Lowell, in speaking of the "Essay on Man," says "that it is a droll medley of inconsistent opinions." It proves only two things beyond a question—that Pope was not a great thinker; and that whenever he found a thought, no matter what, he could express it so tersely, so clearly, and with such smoothness of versification as to give it an everlasting currency."

There is a kind of study of Literature abroad, based upon a scholarship which desires to be recognized as distinctly scientific. It has caught up the spirit of the age in which we live and carries its Scientific methods into the realm of Poetry and criticism. It is chiefly concerned with the external side of Poetry and leaves the interpretation of the thought, and the Philosophy of the Poet, if he has any, to inferior minds. And

so this Scholarship seems to say, that if you have a correct knowledge of verse, of metre, and understand the Philology of the Tongue in which the Poem is written, you are thoroughly equipped to give a correct criticism and speak with authority on any Poem.

Yes! you are thoroughly equipped now to study the body of the Poem, but your training may not have added one particle to an understanding of the rich and hidden treasures of the soul of that Poem. If the teachings of Poetry are so clear to men, why such endless expositions? Why cannot all men go to Emerson and find just as much in him as the best critics with deepest insight can find? What is the sense in Dr. Holmes mentioning the names of critics who have studied Emerson "from the days when Mr. Whipple attracted the attention of our intelligent but unawakened reading community, by his discriminating and appreciative criticisms of Emerson's Lectures" to the recent Essays of Arnold, Morley, Norman and Stedman, if all men have equal interpreting power? And yet in the case of most of these critics, so far as my acquaintance goes with them, they are not exceedingly troubled about Philological points, or bad rhyme, but they are trying to open up Emerson's real nature, not as a Linguist, or as a Philologist, but as a Thinker, Philosopher, Poet.

Not that we mean to undervalue Philology. But Philological accuracy is one thing and keen critical perception is another. It is only when this so-called Scientific, Philological scholarship becomes conceited and assumes to itself the sole authority of criticising a Poem, that we begin to find fault. That a great deal may be learned about the Philology of the Languages in which a Poem is written by considering the Poem Philologically cannot be doubted. Chaucer may be used as an excellent text-book for the study of the English Language.

And yet one may be so taken up with the study of Chaucer Philologically as never to know the real Chaucer. If Chaucer wrote with the idea of simply affording a text-book for the study of the English Language, then a study of the text merely

as such will be sufficient. But if his purpose was a different one, then, with sufficient Philological help, in order to understand his Language, we must break through the body of his poems and penetrate into the region where the soul of these Poems is, in order to understand him rightly.

How much of the real Emerson would reveal itself to any one making simply a study of his Language? And what was uppermost in his own mind when he wrote? Did he, like Pope, have his eyes exclusively on his diction, his manner of expressing himself? If he had, then I suppose that he would have kept on polishing up his poems until all the bad rhymes, the so called hump-backed lines, would have altogether disappeared. We would rather infer, in reading his Poems, and we are told so also by good authority, that he was not over concerned about his manner of expressing himself and that he wrote on rather carelessly, as things came. It is said that the completest and most faultless of all of Emerson's Poems, "The Concord Hymn," such work as might be expected from one who is particular about movement and melody, is not strictly Emersonian. A man like Dr. Holmes, who is thoroughly at home in the art of making verse, and who is a Poet himself, says about Emerson, "that many of us will confess that we like his uncombed verse better, oftentimes, than if it were trimmed more neatly and disposed more nicely." There are excellent critics who, if there were a question of choice, would always prefer a Poem, with a warm soul and rather deformed body, to a deformed soul and a symmetrically developed body. A great authority says that if he were offered the alternative, if he were compelled to give up Gray or Burns, he would retain the latter. Gray's Poetry was the result of accurate critical scholarship. He was careful about the outer garb of the Poem. Burns, it is said, poured "forth his passion-prompted songs." The difference is in their method.

So much then for that class of Poetry whose chief characteristic is the Body. Let us now turn to another class of Poetry whose chief characteristic is the soul. Now I think

that most of us would admit that that is the most rounded man who has a symmetrically developed body and in it a symmetrically developed soul illuminating it. So it is with a Poem. In the Language of Coleridge, "each part is fitted to afford as much pleasure as is compatible with the largest sum in the whole." Now there are Poets who are so intent in speaking out their meaning and so indifferent to art, that their productions are one-sided. Mr. Browning at times is a good illustration of this. Mr. Stedman, in speaking of him, says: "His mind is so alert that its minutest turn of thought must be uttered; he dwells with equal precision upon the meanest and grandest objects, and laboriously jots down every point that occurs to him—Parenthesis within parenthesis. The Poem is all zigzag, criss-cross, at odds and ends—and, though we come out right at last, strength and patience are exhausted in mastering it." The reader of Emerson's Poetry will find, I think, that more or less of this criticism on Browning applies to Emerson. His mind, too, is alert and "its minutest turn of thought must be uttered." His deep insight and power of discrimination, especially in his Poems on nature, take us by surprise.

Rhodora! if the sages ask thee why
 This charm is wasted on the earth and sky,
 Tell them, dear, that if the eyes were made for seeing,
 Then Beauty is its own excuse for being;
 Why thou wert there, O rival of the rose!
 I never thought to ask, I never knew;
 But, in my simple ignorance, suppose
 The self-same Power that brought me here brought you.

Emerson's poetic creed is simple. He makes a statement of it in his poem *Merlin*:

Great is the art,
 Great be the manners, of the bard.
 He shall not his brain encumber
 With the coil of rhythm and number;
 But, leaving rule and pale forethought,
 He shall age climb
 For his rhyme.

'Pass in, pass in,' the angels say,
In to the upper doors,
Nor count compartments of the floors,
By the stairway of surprise.

When Emerson wrote poetry, then, he was more concerned, we would infer from his own standard, about the thought than the form. It seems to have been with him as with all the greatest and most genuine Poets, that it is not he or they that speak, but a Power that speaketh through them. What is this Power? Is it a mere indefinable something, to which not much significance, after all, must be attached? Milton evidently attached a good deal of importance to this indefinable power; so much so that he invoked and called upon this Power in such language as this: "sing, heavenly Muse."

This precisely was Emerson's Muse—"the heavenly Muse," which he calls by the singular name, "Oversoul."

The same Spirit that wrote the Psalms and the Epistle to the Hebrews guided the hands of the Poets in writing their truest and best thoughts. Emerson wrote from within. We fear that he would have severely condemned that scientific analysis of Poetry, which, says one, counts and schedules "the percentage of light endings and of weak endings, of end-stopt and run on verses."

"If we could call up Shakespeare," says Prof. Shairp, "and place before him the various theories about Hamlet, do you think he would own any one of them as his own? Would he not rather tell you with a smile that those clever fellows, the critics, knew far better than himself the thing that he meant to do?" And so we feel that Emerson would smile upon the ingenious analyst, who would come to him with a finely-spun theory of his Poetry of which he never dreamed.

No! to understand Emerson, we must penetrate into the region where his thoughts lie, into his belief, his philosophy, out of which grew his inspiring sentences.

We must put ourselves in the same position as he did, as he looked upon men and things, and then

"Wait a little, you shall see
The portraiture of thing to be."

Emerson's Poetry grew out of him just as the flower grows out of the earth. Coleridge says, "Poetry is the blossom and fragrant of all human thoughts, human passions, emotions, language."

But again it might be interesting to inquire, what was Emerson's real object in writing his Poetry?

Coleridge, in his lectures on Shakespeare and Milton defines Poetry as "the art of communicating whatever we wish to communicate, so as both to express and produce excitement, but for the purpose of immediate pleasure."

Prof. Shairp, whose name I have often mentioned and who always speaks with high authority on the subject of Poetry, says its "true end is to awaken men to the divine side of things, to bear witness to the beauty that clothes the outer world, the nobility that lies hid, often obscured, in human souls, to call forth sympathy for neglected truths, for noble but oppressed persons, for down-trodden causes, and to make men feel that, through all outward beauty and all pure inward affection, God Himself is addressing them." Here, then, are two opposing views. On the one hand, according to Coleridge, the Poem has for its first and chief object the giving of pleasure; on the other hand, according to Shairp, if the Poem does give pleasure, the Poet, in writing it was not thinking about this, but was in love with the truth, and was entirely possessed of it.

To which of these views would Emerson have held? Have we any way of learning? Does he ever express himself on such a subject?

In his Essay on the Poet Emerson says: "The Poet has a new thought; he has a whole new experience to unfold; he will tell us how it was with him, and all men will be the richer in his fortune." We would infer from this, according to Emerson, that what the Poet tries to do in his poem is to give men his thought, his experience, without caring whether he gives pleasure or not.

He says, in one of his short poems :

“ For thought, and not praise,—
Thought is the wages
For which I sell days,—
Will gladly sell ages,
And willing grow old,
Deaf and dumb, and blind and cold,
Melting matter into dreams,
Panoramas which I saw,
And whatever glows or seems,
Into substance, into law.”

You will notice that he says that “thought is the wages” for which he would sell days ; not for praise, not for honor, not for popularity. And the reader of his poetry must remember that since Emerson did not write for entertainment, that he must not look for entertainment.

As in his essays, so in his poetry, he is, in the first place, possessed of the truth ; he feels, sees it, and he gives it to us in such a shape as he saw fit to put it ; and if it gives pleasure, all well,—he is not much concerned about that.

There is a class of people in the world, who even dare to call themselves cultured, who, in all their reading, their seeing, their hearing, are after entertainment. We fear that Emerson will not be popular with them.

Now, culture seems to me no more nor less than a spiritual and intellectual force at work in man which is to thoroughly renovate him and to transform him into the highest ideality possible. What is this spiritual, intellectual force? The truth. How is the truth to bring about such a change or transformation in man? By seeking it simply for pleasure, for entertainment, and if it does not give us the certain desired pleasure or entertainment, abandon the search after it? No! Truth, culture, must be sought for its own sake, and no man or woman can begin to call himself or herself cultured until he or she has given himself or herself up to the truth and permitted the truth to lay hold of him or her, so that the process of renovating and transforming is actually going on. If this gives us

pleasure and entertainment, we have a right to them. It seems to me, then, that those who seek the truth first, in and for its own sake, will have pleasure and entertainment, because they have the truth. Those who seek pleasure and entertainment first will never have them, because they have not the truth, in which consist the pleasure and entertainment.

Those who seek the truth in Emerson will find in him pleasure and entertainment in a greater or less degree. Those who seek first pleasure and entertainment in Emerson will find that he gives them neither. Truth must be loved and sought for its own sake, and is its own reward.

Popularity says to Christianity, Give us pleasure, entertainment. Christ says, Study Me, obey Me; "if ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love," "and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you." Emerson's "popularity must diffuse itself from above downwards," says Dr. Holmes. That is another way of saying, that by patience, perseverance, attention, study, you must climb up, if possible, into the region where Emerson's best thinking is done.

Here is his own version of the poet's mission :

"No jingling serenader's art,
Nor tinkling of piano strings,
Can make the wild blood start
In its mystic springs;
The kingly bard
Must smite the chords rudely and hard,
As with hammer or with mace;
That they may render back
Artful thunder, which conveys
Secrets of the solar track,
Sparks of the supersolar blaze."

Thomas Wentworth Higginson not long ago has said: "It is because Emerson, in his way, and Hawthorne, in his way, touch us at greater depths than Tennyson that their chance for immortality is stronger. Form is doubtless needed in the expression; but in Hawthorne there is no defect of form, and the

frequent defects of this kind in Emerson are balanced by tones and cadences so noble that the exquisite lyre of Tennyson, taken at its best, has never reached them."

Emerson's own lines best become him :

"I know the mighty bards;
I listen when they sing,
And now I know
The secret store
Which these explore,
When they, with torch of genius pierce
The tenfold clouds that cover
The riches of the universe
From God's adoring lover;

"And if to me it is not given
To fetch one ingot thence
Of that unfading gold of Heaven
His merchants may dispense,
Yet well I know the royal mine,
And know the sparkle of its ore;
Know Heaven's truth from lies that shine:
Explored, they teach us to explore."

VIII.

WHY WE ARE NOT CONSUMED.

BY REV. A. A. PFANSTIEHL.

ONE of the striking characteristics of Jewish history is its perpetuity. That is to say, it continued on in the past and continues on to-day, in one purposed course. 'Tis true there were variations and deviations in its development, but yet it evidently moved forward to the accomplishment of a definite end not yet attained. In this it differed widely from the history of all other nations. They rose and fell; they were temporary; one day in the height of power and glory; the next, shorn of all distinction, they passed away. This was not the case with the Jews. There was a perpetuity among them that defied and survived any and all disasters, any shocks, any attempts at destroying it. And it was put to as severe tests as any people ever endured, if not severer. Conquered time and again; plundered by invading enemies; led forth into dreary and long-continued captivity; subjugated to abject slavery to foreign powers—yet never did they lose their identity as a people distinct from all others; never were they consumed. What people on the face of the earth could ever have been subjected to the treatment and to the various changes and trials as a nation as were the Jews, and yet, like them, have survived them all? And look at them to-day! They still remain a distinct people, although without a home, and in many cases a by-word and a hissing among the nations; they have no country they can call their own; they are continually subjected to persecution; they evidently are suffering the terrible penalty of the rash, desperate, blood-curdling cry of their enraged fathers, when putting the Son of God,

the long-promised Messiah, to death upon the Cross: "*His blood be upon us and our children.*" And although nearly 2000 years of wandering, persecution, homelessness, all the while nationless, have passed away since they imprecated this awful curse upon themselves and their children, yet to-day they are as little consumed as a people—I mean they are no more destroyed, not in the sense of numbers so much as in distinct traits of character and idiosyncrasies and individuality, as they were when it was uttered. People who conquered them, nations that persecuted them have lived their day, and—where are they now? They are gone. But the "sons of Jacob are not consumed."

The question arises: How is this to be explained? Why is this? 'Tis certainly not because they were and are great warriors; not because they have a strong centralized government—for they have none at all; nor are they entrenched in the united strength of great numbers gathered together, as were the Chinese for centuries, behind heavy walls, secluding them from all attacks of enemies. Why is it, then, that they are not consumed? Can you explain it on any naturalistic or rationalistic principles? Or are you ready to say that it is a mere matter of chance? But the course of a people's or a nation's history cannot be accounted for on the principle of chance outcomes or natural self-development. And especially is this true of that people who have always been called God's chosen race, the "sons of Jacob." The turns of all history are well defined and definitely marked. There is such a thing as "*The Philosophy of History*"—a philosophy that indicates and implies a Divine Mind, a Controlling Power, a Supreme Intelligence, in the affairs of men and nations. So that Schlegel, in pointing out the course of this philosophy and its Divine wisdom, may well remark: "Without the idea of a Godhead regulating the course of human destiny, of an All-ruling Providence, the history of the world would be a labyrinth without an outlet—a confused pile of ages buried upon ages, a mighty tragedy without a right beginning or a proper ending." * And our own Franklin but

* "*Philosophy of History*," p. 891.

voiced the experience of all thoughtful men when, at 80 years of age, speaking in favor of daily prayers in the National Convention, he emphatically said: "Do we imagine that we no longer need His assistance? I have lived now a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this, *that God rules in the affairs of men.*"

Lowell may be questioned when he says:

"History's pages but record

One death-grapple in the darkness 'twixt old systems and the Word;
Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne."

But there can be no manner of question as to the truth of these lines:

"Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above His own."

In answer, therefore, to the question, why the sons of Jacob are not consumed, are the words of God spoken by the prophet Malachi: "*For I am the Lord; I change not;*" that Lord who had said to Abraham, and re-affirmed it to Isaac, and assured Jacob of it: "I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." (Gen. 17: 7). He is the same in all generations; He changeth not, and, therefore, His declared purposes concerning His chosen people could not and would not be thwarted by any power in heaven, earth, or hell, or the combined powers of all universes upon universes; His truthfulness could not be falsified by any device or power or frailty of man; and His love would be shown, His long-suffering manifested though His people forgot Him, aye, even so far as to put to death His only-begotten Son!

We have spoken of this characteristic of Israel's history, because it teaches us wherein our only hope consists that we will not be consumed. Are we God's people? Are we the spiritual "sons of Jacob?" Then this is what God says to

us: "I am the Lord; I change not: *therefore, ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.*"

Look at this: I. Applied to our Christian Nation. II. As applied to the Church of Christ. III. As applied to individuals.

I. As applied to our Christian Nation.

I say advisedly *Christian Nation*; for are we not such? Was not this nation founded as such? Do not the providences of God in our history point clearly to this one thing, that, as a Christian nation, we are to be a great power—cannot I say without boasting, the greatest power for true civilization, true civil liberty, and a pure, spiritual Christianity in the world's future, whatever may be the turns of history? And if we, as a people, are to have our hearts filled with well-founded hopes of perpetuity, wherein lie these hopes? If *we* are not to be consumed, why is it? Wherein lie our hopes for the future? Are they in our unprecedented and rapidly-increasing wealth? our material resources? our vast numbers? as many of our Fourth of July orators would have us believe? Are they in temporal prosperity, in future military glory, in our secular institutions? Let us ask, if these are sufficient foundations to build our hopes upon, why is it that the temporally prosperous Orientals, rich in material possessions, in military glory that has never been dimmed by modern war achievements, are consumed, while the readily conquered, poor, subject Jews to-day live, and never have been consumed, though scattered; and indicate unmistakably that the promises concerning and to them, that they will again be gathered into a compact nation, will not fail of fulfillment?

No, we must look for a better foundation than mere material resources. And it is timely to call emphatic attention to this in our day. For think one moment of the superstructure that is being built upon this foundation. Look at our public morals. Thoughtful men are inquiring seriously whether these are improving or not. And this is the testimony of a recent writer of well-known character and acknowledged ability and well-earned reputation. He says: "As a result of much observa-

tion and inquiry, not without reflection and a spirit of hope and trust in God for our future, I must decide in the negative, and own my fears that the elements that destroy great nations are powerfully at work toward our premature corruption and decay." * We cannot be charged with unwarranted pessimism when we concur in this view of the matter. Take it in regard to two institutions recognized as the "two foundation-stones of all morality," viz.: the Sabbath and the Family. Is it questioned that the Sabbath is being more and more desecrated? No. Infidels acknowledge it with joy, while true Christians look upon it with sadness. 'Tis, therefore, not a mere false note of gloomy believers that is sounded in regard to the danger that threatens us in our Sabbath desecration with Sunday papers, Sunday trains, Sunday picnics, Sunday trade. And then think of the family! Aye, even the Christian family. What earnest Christian heart grieved not at the emphatic language of the committee of a late General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church when speaking of the state of religion in the Narrative in regard to the neglect of family religion and especially of the prevailing neglect of the family altar! Listen to the earnest words to which every pastor says *amen*, for they cannot be repeated too often, and in too many places: "The one feature of this review of our history for the past year which stands out in the most painful contrast with every other, the one thing which the Presbyteries practically unite in deploring, is the unfaithfulness of very many of their members in the vital matter of Family Worship." How blessed it would truly be if all our families would heed the warnings which the highest judicatory of the Presbyterian Church reiterated "against this dishonor which they bring upon a covenant-keeping God, against the reproach which they bring upon their own consistency, against the peril to which they expose those who are dearest to them, who do not constantly acknowledge God in their homes and amid their household gathered stately about the altar of Family Worship."

* Bishop Coxe in *The Chautauquan* for April, 1888.

But consider the dangers of the family in another connection. "In the State of Massachusetts the number of divorces in proportion to marriages is one to fifteen; in Vermont one to thirteen; in Rhode Island and Connecticut one to nine; and so on in our country, while in England it is only one to three hundred, and in Belgium one to two hundred." * Well may it be asked, therefore: "Will some one tell us how the moral condition of Christendom is growing better when the two oldest and most sacred moral institutions in the world are growing into a condition worse and worse?"

And now what about crime? It has been stated by a statistician that the proportion of murders to the population is England, 237 to 10,000,000 of population; Belgium, 240; France, 265; Scandinavia, 266; Germany, 279; Ireland, 294; Austria, 310; Russia, 325; Italy, 504; Spain, 533; the United States, 850!

Then take intemperance. The deaths from strong drink, according to Mulhall, in every 1000 of the population are in England 2 every year; Scotland, 3; Ireland, 2; France, 2; Switzerland, 3; Sweden, 6; and in New York, 12; with the same large proportion in other States! Add to this the evils of intemperance, with its \$900,000,000 annually worse than wasted, for these millions of dollars fill our jails and poor-houses and insane asylums; invade the sanctity of the home, and menace the Church and State alike with dangers which may not be lightly thought of.

But enough has been said to emphasize the truth that material prosperity and worldly riches are no safe foundation to build upon, and are no security to any nation of perpetuity. For remember that this large showing of crime, of Sabbath desecration, and of the destruction of family life, is in a country more prosperous in worldly affairs, richer in material resources, more commanding in influence and power, than any nation now existing, or that ever did exist on the face of the earth.

* Dr. A. J. Frost in "Prophetic Studies," p. 175.

Where, then, is our hope? Is there any hope of perpetuity? Yes. *It is in God*; it is in the thought that He changes not; that as He was gracious unto His people of old, and kept them from being consumed, so, if we will as a nation, as a people, turn to Him we will be preserved. "Christians believe, as has been felicitously said, that though Satan is mighty, God is Almighty. It was His purpose once to save a city if ten righteous could be found in it." And, therefore, to once more quote Bishop Coxe, "Our hope for the future of our country is based upon what God has thus taught us, and is inspired by confidence that thousands of holy and prayerful men devote their lives to the good of all their neighbors, and intercede daily through the great Intercessor for the preservation of our national institutions. Let the world mock at our simple faith as it may; we must still cherish the conviction of early Christians that the world stands because of the prayers of the faithful," and their prayers avail in behalf of millions because God changes not. Did He hear Abraham's prayer for wicked Sodom and Gomorrah? Would he save the cities reeking in crime and vileness, so that the stench thereof went up to the very throne of God, for ten righteous souls that might perchance be found in them? and is He the same God to-day? Will He not then save this nation, that has so many noble, devoted, consecrated people of God who are crying daily for mercy, and are devoting their time and talents and money to saving souls, if they turn unto Him in all humility and truth and penitence? Do you doubt that if the 12,000,000 of Protestant Evangelical Church members in our country turned as one man to God to implore His grace and mercy, He would bless this nation with distinguishing mercies of purity, godliness, honesty, truth, spirituality of heart?

II. But look at this truth as applied to the Church of Christ. Why can we work on with hope and confidence of ultimate success? Simply because of the blessed truth: *God changes not.* He has said concerning His Church, by the mouth of His own Son, our Saviour, that she shall never be conquered, the gates

of hell, even, shall never be able to prevail against her. Surely it is not because the Church is so loyal, or so generous, or so active that Satan and the world cannot overcome her, and because, by loyalty, or generosity, or activity and the goodness of her members she commends herself or challenges the love of God and His continued mercies and protection. No, no. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Let us see.

The Church is doing much more for and in aggressive work and for Foreign and Home missions than she has ever done in the world before in all her history; and we thank God for it; here is hope and encouragement. But that is not the point. This is *the* question: Is the Church keeping pace in work with her temporal prosperity and increase in the ability and power to do good and increase in numbers and benevolence? This is the test-question. Look at it. Take England: If she can spend annually \$620,000,000 for beer, spirits and wine, \$65,000,000 for tobacco and snuff, \$62,500,000 for amusements, surely God, who has so graciously protected her, and *who gave her all she has*, may expect and demand more than \$6,250,000 for missions to the heathen, the annual sum given by England, although that is an immense sum when compared to what used to be given. And just so with our country. We give vastly much more than we used to give, 'tis true; but when God has blessed the Church members of the United States with one-fifth of the entire wealth of the country, and they give only *one-sixteenth part of one per cent.* for the salvation of the heathen world, surely God can demand with justice vastly much more, and this giving does not commend us to the continued protection and favor of God. The estimated wealth of the Protestant Church members in the United States is \$11,078,840,000, and their annual increase of wealth, after paying all expenses of living, luxuries, ornaments, gifts, contributions, etc., is nearly \$500,000,000!!

Jesus said that the large gifts of the rich that were thrown into the treasury did not count in the sight of God for real usefulness as much as the mite of the poor widow. Why? Be-

cause the former were really a pittance doled out to the Lord from an abundance, while the latter was a real sacrifice given in prayer and love.

It is not, therefore, because the Church to-day, though doing much by liberality and activity, assures herself of perpetuity. For what is what she does compared to what she might do and is able to do? Our only hope of security and continuance in the world is in this, that God changes not, and that His purpose in regard to His Church cannot and will not be changed; and hence we labor on, encouraged, hopeful—yea, we even joyfully proceed upon our way. If the church member will but thus go forward, he need not look with misgiving into the future in regard to the Church. "The unchangeableness of God is the sheet-anchor of the Church." Let him by faith lay hold on this anchor, and it will moor him fast to that which no storm can shake or rend.

III. And now but one word about this truth *as applied to individuals*. For after all 'tis here that this matter affects us ultimately most of all. If we are to be saved at all, it will not be because we belong to a religious body or organization. People will not enter heaven in a body politic, and hence, after all, whether the State or the Church will be consumed or not does not necessarily affect our personal salvation. This latter depends entirely upon our own individual attitude and character before God. How stand we before God, who changes not? Are we clothed with the spotless robe of Christ's righteousness? Are our hope and trust in God the Saviour? Futile is it to build upon any presumed native goodness on our part; upon our exemplary moral character, taking for granted that it is exemplary, for what are these after all? How uncertain! How changeable! But God is certain, God is unchangeable. "I am the Lord; I change not; *therefore are the sons of Jacob not consumed.*"

IX.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM; EXEGESIS OF ST. JOHN 3:5.

BY T. G. A.

SOME remarks in an article in the present number of this REVIEW, at the opening, in regard to Sacramentarian Protestant Churches, and others more pronounced at the close in regard to the Sacraments of the Christian Church, make the impression that the exegesis in the otherwise calm and able discussion of the subject in that article is unduly influenced by preconceived dogmatic views. It impresses one that the labored argument has very largely for its object to get rid of the idea of any serious importance as attaching to Christian Baptism.

When the writer asserts that "the salvation of the soul is in no sense dependent on an outward ceremony," he, of course, begs the question that a sacrament is merely an outward ceremony. A minister in our church once remarked that if baptism is only an empty outward sign, then God is the greatest formalist in the universe, for He instituted it. How the writer can assume, as he does in different places in his article, that a sacrament is in no way essentially connected with our salvation, according to the Word of God, and yet bear in mind the words of Christ in connection with the great commission, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned," it is difficult for us to understand.

He says, "The one object of faith is the word of the Gospel of God's grace." We might suggest that Christ Himself is the primary object of faith. "Ye search the Scriptures because in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which

testify of me." But we pass this because the incarnate Word and the written Word, or Gospel, are in a profound sense one; but are not the sacraments a part of the Gospel of God's grace? And are we not bound to obey the requirement of Christ in being baptized as well as in believing? And can a man feel secure of his salvation who refuses to partake of the Sacrament of the Saviour's body and blood, thereby showing forth His death until He come? And is, then, the salvation of the soul in *no sense* dependent on an outward ceremony (if by outward ceremony is here meant the Holy Sacrament)? For if the sacraments are not meant here by "an outward ceremony," we are at a loss to know what, in the connection, is meant.

In a certain sense the sacraments are subordinate to the Word, for it is the Word of God that constitutes the sacraments, according to the word of Augustine, "*Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum*," but in this sense the sacraments are not placed in antithesis to the Word, for they are a part of the whole Gospel, and therefore co-ordinate to the Word. No one laid more emphasis on faith than Luther, and yet he condemned with equal emphasis the "heavenly prophets," who undervalued and ignored the sacraments. It seems to us a wrong view of the whole subject to place faith in any sort of antithesis to, or comparison with, baptism, because baptism is an act of God towards man, while faith is the act of man towards God in response. As well might a comparison be made between the Word of God and man's faith in the work of salvation. Faith alone does not save. Faith is simply the spiritual organ for the reception of the grace of salvation which God offers and gives to man.

A sign, or outward ceremony, as presented in the Scriptures, has just as much meaning and virtue in it as God puts into it; no more, no less. The "bow in the cloud" had as much, yea, the same meaning, as the words, I will not again destroy the world by a flood. Circumcision in its time had so much significance, and stood so vitally connected with membership in the Jewish Church, that God declared that the person that is not

circumcised shall be cut off from the congregation and people of God. A naturalization paper, or the outward ceremony of being naturalized, does not produce any subjective change in the person naturalized, yet it has a necessary and vital connection with his citizenship. Since signs and seals, "outward ceremonies," have so much significance in man's natural life, it is not at all strange that God should make use of them in reference to man's higher life. If God gives man a promise, and joins to that promise an outward sign and seal, it does not become us to speak slightly of God's appointment in that form. And because circumcision ceased to have significance because it was superseded by the in-coming of the new dispensation, it does not seem to us apposite, but rather a perversion of Scripture, to apply what St. Paul said of it to the sacraments of the new dispensation. The writer ventures a good deal when he asserts that baptism is nowhere spoken of in the Word of God in connection with regeneration except in the passage in St. John 3: 5 (if that, indeed, does refer to baptism, which he refutes), unless possibly the phrase, "laver of regeneration," used in one of the Epistles. St. Paul certainly connects it in different places with putting on Christ, with being joined with Christ in His death, being buried with Him and raised with Him in His resurrection unto a new life, and surely all these phrases signify a radical change like that in regeneration.

We do not mean, in these remarks, to assert anything in sympathy with the *opus operatum* view of the sacraments held in the Roman Catholic Church, nor any view as to the particular relation between the outward sign and the inward grace of a sacrament, but simply to show that the sacraments are referred to in Scripture as having a very important relation to man's salvation. And now we beg to append what we conceive to be a proper exegesis of the passage in St. John 3: 5. The writer refutes this in his article with a good deal of ingenuity and learning; but we submit whether a meaning which requires so much explanation, and which the writer himself thinks does not easily and readily appear in the passage, does not, on this

very account, seem to be doubtful. And we submit also, whether the explanation we give does not seem more natural. The writer grants that it has the support of the teaching of the Church in all ages. Yet his own original interpretation will doubtless interest, if it does not convince, the readers of this REVIEW.

According to our view, the passage in John 3: 5 clearly has a reference to baptism. The Jews were familiar with the application of water, or baptism, as a cleansing ordinance. Hence they were not surprised when John the Baptist came preaching and baptizing unto repentance, as a preparation for the coming of the Messiah. In Mark 1: 8, John says: "I indeed baptize you with water; but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." The Saviour now says to Nicodemus: The new birth of which I speak is something more than the change indicated by the baptism of John, which was a baptism unto repentance for the remission of sin,—the negative side only, as *remission of sins*; but it includes a positive side also, which consists in the renewal wrought by the Holy Ghost. This regeneration could not take place until the advent of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. Then Christian baptism, instituted by Christ after His resurrection and before His ascension, was performed for the first time, as the sacrament of regeneration. This does not, indeed, determine the relation of the outward sign in Christian baptism to the inward grace signified. What this relation is depends upon our view of the nature and significance of a sacrament.

The reference in the passage to water, we think, refers directly to John's baptism. The new birth is something more than repentance and remission of sin; it is also, in addition and especially, a renewal wrought by the Holy Ghost, who came on the Day of Pentecost. The Saviour clearly implies that water would continue to be used in receiving members into the Christian Church; but its use now would be connected with the gift of the Holy Ghost. Whatever relation held between John's application of water and the remission of sins, on

condition of repentance, such and similar relation now would hold in Christian baptism between the application of water and the gift of the Holy Ghost.

St. Peter states this clearly in his sermon on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2: 38): "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Here we have the repentance and the remission of sins indicated in John's baptism, and then to this is added "*the gift of the Holy Ghost.*" This seems to be an application of the words of our Lord to Nicodemus: "born of water and the Spirit."

The question, of course, still remains, What is the relation, in the sacrament of baptism, between the application of water and the gift of the Holy Ghost? In the first Scotch Confession Baptism is defined *to be* the incorporation into Christ. "And this we utterly condemn the vanity of those who affirm sacraments to be nothing but naked and bare signs. No, we assuredly believe that by Baptism we are ingrafted in Christ Jesus," etc. In the Westminster Confession this is so changed as to make Baptism "*a sign and seal* of ingrafting into Christ," but clearly the meaning is that the sacrament is not a mere "naked and bare sign," but carries with it, where the proper conditions are at hand, the inward grace of which it is a sign and a seal.

One of the articles of the *Peace-basis* adopted by the Reformed Church in the United States affirms that where the proper conditions are present in the subject the grace of the sacrament is made over to him at the time the outward sign is applied or received, and this we believe to be the doctrine of all the Reformed Churches in the Reformation of the 16th century.

There were three prevailing views on the subject of the sacraments in the time of the Reformation: 1st, the Roman Catholic *opus operatum* view, which made the effect of the sacraments independent of the subjective condition of faith on the part of the subject; 2d, the Lutheran view, which so connected

the sign and the grace signified that when the one was received the other was also received, although in the case of unbelievers it was received unto condemnation; and 3d, the Reformed or Calvinistic view, that the grace of the sacrament could be received only by faith, and in the case of unbelievers participating, not having faith, they could receive only the outward elements, and this to their condemnation also, inasmuch as they made light of a sacred ordinance of God. The Zwinglian view, which made the sacraments only outward signs (or which, at least, was charged with doing so), was generally rejected in the Reformed confessions that came to have authority. There can be no question as to the significance and importance attached to the sacraments in all the authoritative Reformed symbols of the 16th century, and it is a grave question, we think, whether this view has not been largely departed from in large portions of the Reformed Churches at the present day.

But we did not intend to enter upon this point. Let the reader read John the Baptist's words, Mark 1: 8, and then our Saviour's words, St. John 3: 5, and finally the words of St. Peter, Acts 2: 38, and see whether Christ does not clearly refer to the use of water in Baptism in what He says to Nicodemus, directly, indeed, to John's Baptism, but indirectly and proleptically to Christian Baptism, as being more than John's Baptism, or, at least, to the gift of the Holy Spirit as being more than what was signified by John's Baptism.

X.

SIMON BAR-JONA : THE STONE AND THE ROCK.

"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

BY MRS. T. C. PORTER.

CHAPTER II.

A PECULIAR STONE.

"Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee."—Matt. xvi. 17.

SECTION I.

Further Significance of Simon's New Name.

SEEKING to discover the deeper and hidden treasures of that "stone" in which "a new name was written" and given to the son of Jonas, and speaking of the Messiah more particularly as the divinely-created Son of man, did He, that student of the Scriptures, when looking at Simon and thinking of the words of Daniel, "Thou sawest a stone cut out of the mountain without hands," also recall these words of Isaiah: "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation?"

He knew that as the "living stone" of Daniel was Himself, so, too, was the "precious corner-stone" of Isaiah, and that this could only be laid "in Zion for a foundation," by the confession of His eternal divinity, which would therefore be His and the disciples' most important public act. Foreseeing then with the quick discernment of a prophet that Simon would become a believer in His special creation, He also foresaw that he would likewise be the first confessor of His eternal generation. Hence by immediately pronouncing him "Cephas" He further signified that he should be the chief of the apostles; and, therefore, in each list of "the twelve," given by the evan-

gelists, Simon Peter's name "leads all the rest." At once the Christ assigned him his place in the temple of living stones, of which He is the sole builder. Even as He ranked John the Baptist next Himself a prophet in the Jewish, so he ranked Simon Peter an apostle in the Christian Church, and there he must be left, since the Divine caller and builder miscalls and misplaces no one. As He was to be "the Head of the body, the Church," which as one Man is finally to take possession of the whole earth, so on the day of Pentecost Simon Peter was to be "the mouth of the LORD," for notwithstanding God may speak with His own voice, yet must He preach and act through men; and to this apostle's prompt, bold and untiring energy and zeal, after the ascension of Jesus, must be ascribed, under God, the formal opening and establishing of the visible Christian Church. Therefore, to the peculiar significance of his name—first chosen and called—must be added first confessor and first apostle. Though all the members are but one body, yet as the foot cannot say to the hand, I am the hand; nor the hand to the foot, I am the foot; but each must be where God has put it, and do its appointed work, so it is of him who alone could fill the place for which he had been selected, and was yet to be prepared, and the position to which God raised him, high as it may be, none may gainsay or resist. "If I will, what is that to thee?"

SECTION II.

Simon's Confession and the Baptist's Compared.

The confessions of John the Baptist and of Simon Bar-jona were not, by any means, the same. Had they been, Christ would not have blessed St. Peter as if he had at that moment and for the first time confessed a new and unheard-of thing, saying, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." He intimated thereby that the like had never before been spoken, or even known. Peter was confessing something entirely new, which he had received

from God alone. Not even from Jesus his Master had he learned it, except incidentally. He was adding to the confession of the Baptist, as St. John the Divine adds to his. Of Christ's one composite life, His forerunner declared the *divinely created* human essence, and *temporal* nature, even to the sure mortality of the latter. But while Simon Peter also confessed this (except the mortality) he rises infinitely above the Baptist in further declaring of Christ's life its *uncreated* and *eternal nature*—living *spirit*. And the beloved disciple, rising still higher, adds to these the last and highest declaration of the Messiah's wonderful person, that which lies back of John's and Peter's previous confessions and gives them all their strength—the *uncreated essence* of Christ's life, and this in its indestructible form and unchangeable quality of triune humanity or living *life*. Hence Peter and John may be called His twin confessors as He is "spirit" and "life," and in their own lives and fates the twin representatives of Himself and His Church.

Had the Baptist known at the period of his confession, or at any time after, that their Messiah was also the eternal Son of God incarnate, it would, no doubt, have been as much his duty to declare this truth to his disciples, as His immaculate conception and vicarious death. But, had he known the first, he would have been a Christian in one of the highest meanings of the term, and the Messiah excluded him entirely from any infringement on Simon's peculiar position and work, in the words, "The least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." John only preached this kingdom as "at hand." Its nature and distinguishing features—especially the new birth—he did not know. That the whole ceremonial and legal economy would be swept away, and the evangelical and spiritual brought in, he could not discover. Though the Saviour he proclaimed was for the world, it was the world converted to Judaism. The stern preacher of the law knew little of the mild mercy of the gospel. Christ's manner of working, His gentleness, patience and long-suffering were an enigma to him who came in "the spirit and power of Elias." His startling earnestness as a

preacher, no doubt, arose from his knowledge that Jesus was to die vicariously; but the mode of His death (crucifixion) was a secret to him. *That* Christ did not reveal even at Peter's confession, which took place after John's death. And, though Jesus declared that among them that are born of women there had not risen a greater than the Baptist, that he was "more than a prophet," in being born to herald the Messiah, yet by immediately adding the significant words, "notwithstanding the least in the kingdom of heaven" (or Christian Church) "is greater than he," he intimated that they were greater not only in light and knowledge and privileges, but in point of birth, because each member in it, "hand" and "foot" alike, is *born directly*—and this is their full equality—of but one Human Parent, Jesus Christ the LORD.

Their creation, direct and unmediated, suggests that in this respect Christ's people are, even here, "equal unto the angels;" and "as" or like them in another—the non-transmission of their new life—for the life of the last Adam is not like that of the first, a *race-life*. Oh, no! Every Christian child is born of the old Adamic life of his parents, and must be brought to the new Adam to receive of His life in the appointed way of baptism. But neither are Christians on that account in this world, nor will they, in the next, be angels. When done forever with the old life, and become "the children of the resurrection," they will still be men and women and children. The lovely variety of the race will be preserved, it having been created for God's wise purpose of surpassing the angels in showing forth His glory. However, though not a race, the sons of the new Adam are a family, for of Him "the whole *family* in heaven and earth is named."

Compared with the prophets preceding him, John the Baptist was indeed "a burning and a shining light;" very different, however, from "the Sun of righteousness," whose beams have since filled the world with light and life; and John departed longing for a fuller revelation. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," was his highest

faith. But this was much. It was more than Simon Bar-jona had realized when he confessed the eternal nature of the Messiah, and the lack of which made him say, "Be it far from thee, Lord; this (suffering and death) shall not be unto thee;" and what, after that disclosure of his ignorance of Christ's work, God, who had given him such superior knowledge of Christ's person, was pledged to teach him, even though it could only be learned by Simon through a peculiar and painful personal experience.

John, the Scripture says, was "filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb." But it must be remembered that it was the Holy Ghost of the old covenant, where actual regeneration was only signified and promised, but not given; and for John, who had been limited by the will of God to that covenant, it was a surpassing honor to have been born to lay his hand on the head of Jesus of Nazareth, the Paschal Lamb, and publicly declare, as he virtually did: "This is he of whom Moses and David wrote, and all the prophets bore witness, our Messiah, divinely human, who is to fulfill in his death all the types and shadows of the ceremonial law, and in so doing bear away the sin of the world." It made him greater than any prophet that had yet risen. But, because of that restriction, he could declare only a part of the Messiah's person, the created and temporal nature of His life, not the eternal; the expiatory portion of His work, the office of Saviour, not of Mediator; the cleansing with His blood or life laid down, not restoring with his life taken up. It is true, John said: "After me cometh a man which is preferred before me: *for he was before me.*" But in view of the limitation, it is reasonable to infer that by the expression: "He was before me," he meant not His pre-existence as the eternal Logos, but that Jesus was the Lamb ordained "before the foundation of the world." Had he known Him to be also the only begotten Son incarnate, He could not have sent his disciples to inquire: "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?"

The signal distinction of being the first to confess this, one of the highest doctrines of the Christian faith, God had reserved for Simon Bar-jona. He was selected and set apart by Him for an apprehension and declaration of the Messiah's person, which should make him as great (with the exception of St. John the Divine), beyond his fellows in the new church, as the Baptist beyond his in the old. At the set time he was to speak clearly and decidedly, with words and emphasis unmistakable, and not only affirm heartily in private to the Messiah and before his brethren, but, later, cry out boldly and plainly, in the city of Jerusalem, to scribes and priests, His "betrayers and murderers," to Jews and Gentiles, strangers and foreigners (as he did on the day of Pentecost): "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, *both LORD (Κύριον, JEHOVAH) and Christ.*" *

In that time of, appalling degeneracy, when the Church was filled with infidels and the world with heathen, when men regarded with indifference the beheading of John the Baptist, and Jews and Romans united to crucify Jesus of Nazareth; when they could slay in quick succession two of the greatest prophets that ever lived; a man was needed to cry aloud and spare not—to restrain neither voice nor conscience, but charge both Jews and Gentiles with their crimes, and insist as necessary for their forgiveness and salvation nothing short of the sacrifice of highest God and Man in one single person—"Jesus of Nazareth." And Simon Bar-jona was this much-needed man. Therefore was he chosen and destined to be the first herald in the new kingdom, as John had been the last in the old; but the tones which Peter should utter, compared with the notes the Baptist sounded, were to be tones of thunder; for in declaring "that same Jesus" to be "the LORD" from heaven, he was starting the trumpet-voice which shall raise the dead and change the living.

Foreseeing this, and knowing that he would be the glad and

* Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible." Article, SON OF GOD.

ready herald of the first public proclamation of His eternal divinity, a truth which was to be proclaimed successively, and more and more clearly, the Jewish Messiah, who was not yet revealed, as indeed He could not be, "the fulness of time" not having come, and who consequently spake figuratively in the word "Cephas" (a Stone), predicted and promised that Simon Bar-jona should be called and become a Christian, yet to be proved and manifested first and greatest of them all, and placed him next Himself in His future visible Church, besides appointing him afterward equally with the other apostles a separate "throne" in his triumphant reign.

SECTION III.

The Baptist and His Work.

Though Mary and Elizabeth knew that Jesus was the promised Messiah, and John His destined forerunner, it is not likely that either mother told these things to her son. They may have felt, by a divine instinct, that these must be left for God to reveal to each in His own time and way. John no doubt was assured of his destiny as the forerunner, when he received the commission to preach and to baptize; but of the fact that Jesus was really the Christ, he declares he was only convinced when he baptized Him. "And I knew Him not; but He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, 'Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.' And I saw, and bare record that this is *the Son of God*;" by which he meant that Jesus was the true Messiah. The angel of announcement had given Him this title—"Wherefore also that Holy Thing which is born of thee shall be called the Son of God." The Son of Mary in being conceived of her life by the Holy Ghost—"the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee"—was to be called "the Son of God." As the LORD incarnate, the Messiah was also to be called "the Son of (the living)

God," but this revelation was to be made later, and after the Baptist's death.

John's mission was to prepare the way of the Lord by preaching repentance and baptizing many people. He was "sent to bear witness of the *Light*," not of the *Life*. His baptism brought the last and highest form of the re-creating Spirit under the strictly old dispensation—the awakening energy of God. This is also the first and faintest form of the same Spirit under the new, as these two dispensations touch each other and are united in Jesus. This energy heralded, first of all, the revival and the return of man's life to that essential unity which it possessed in Adam, while he was yet one and undivided, and "the Lord God" having "formed him of the dust of the ground," and "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, "man," the whole man, (body included) "became a living soul, a being who, whether he attained to the true end of his existence or not, was alive forever. The "breath of lives" * it is in the original; and as there are "not three Gods," nor "three Lords," but three distinct and inseparable Persons, or "subsistences," in one God and one Lord, probably it may be considered the One breath of Three lives; and thus the words in the first account of man's creation—"And *God* said, let us make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness," † joined to the words in the second account, "and man became a living soul"—would mean that by this breathing man became, as to the form of his essence, like God, a trinity in unity; which most surely the incarnation and baptismal formula teach. In contrast with the creatures below him, the term, "a living soul," may be interpreted a self-conscious and rational being, and therefore

* Bush, Gen. ii. 7.

† "I know that some scornors ridicule our concluding a distinction of Persons from the words of Moses, where he introduces God thus speaking: 'Let us make man in our image.' Yet pious readers perceive how frigidly and foolishly Moses would have introduced this conference, if in one God there had not subsisted a plurality of Persons." Calvin's Institutes. Vol. I. Book 1, p. 144.

one who, unlike them, should not only live forever, but be responsible for his actions. In distinction from the angels, who were created prior to him and the natural world, it may be interpreted a *life-giving* soul, for the angels though also self-conscious and rational and accountable were not life-giving, or the possessors of generative life, having been created without one common head, and not like the children of Adam in continuous and successive generations.

By his physical formation of "the dust of the ground," or pre-existent matter, the first man was "natural," equal, or on a level with other creatures. But by God's breathing at the same time "into his nostrils the breath of life," or making the *form of his life* a co-equal and inseparable trinity, he was also above, or superior to, all other creatures and given dominion over them. Now, in order to reach and cover the entire range of man's life, and thus become his complete Redeemer, and also God's perfect Vindicator, it was necessary that "the Son of Adam" or "man," who was to stand in Adam's place, should first be born miraculously, or by the Spirit, of his life in this its full extent, and, too, of the entire man, as in being made or created, he was necessarily finite, and through the power of his own will changeable for the better or the worse, and mortal, being able to sin and die. Of this weakness of his nature God had fairly and thoroughly warned him—"For in the day that thou eatest thereof, " *thou*, the whole man, spirit, soul and body in one single self-consciousness—"shalt surely die," or "dying thou shalt die." Being already in virtue of his creation *able* to disobey and to die, he should, by actually disobeying, "surely die." That is, he should die "unto God," in being by his disobedience cut off from Him whose life would have insured him a happy immortality. Therefore, having eaten of "the tree of knowledge" without God's permission, and against His express command, and so partaken of its evil only, man entire did, in that very day, begin to die. And had not his Maker interposed to prevent it, he would by also eating in his changed condition of "the tree of life," or promise and pledge

of immortality, have lived forever in this sinful and dying state. "Lest he eat and live forever!" The tree was a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death.

Second, it was also necessary that "the Son of man," who was to stand in Adam's place, should be born of his life as it was in its beginning *one*, whole and undivided, and thus be *the*, or the *only* Son of man; the only real, true, complete and perfect Son of the whole or perfect life of man; in whom every individual member of the race, man, woman and child might find His deepest redemption and highest perfection; and in whom the life of man as a *race-life* was consequently closed. By means of this birth he would also become a partaker of the first man's moral character while he was yet unfallen, and be like him as he then was and for some time after God had further made him male and female—sinless. Thus by His perfection in creation and birth solely of Him as God made Him, and by inheritance of His innocence and sinlessness, the last Adam more than equalled the first. But by, unlike him, further maintaining these and adding to them His own holiness, He far exceeded him; and by voluntarily dying for him and his race He superseded him as its head and father, and is therefore styled in the new kingdom, "the Beginning of the Creation of God." God's natural creation is as dear to Him as His spiritual generation, and at the "restitution of all things," the former will be fully vindicated in the eyes of an intelligent universe, for when finished, he pronounced the purely natural "good," and with the supernatural added to it in the person of man, "very good."

Moreover, having created man, his Maker and Father left him not nameless, an orphan in the world, but that true essence of his life which He had made after the pattern of His own, and the quality of which can never be changed, nor form be broken, He "called *Adam*," or man. Adam is the Hebrew for man, and in that language, like man in ours, it is "the generic term for the whole race." In this sense it is used in the genealogy of St. Luke's Gospel, where it is said of Jesus, "who was

the Son of Adam, who was the Son of God." But, Adam being also the first father's personal name, Jesus, in acknowledging His Sonship from him, never called Himself the Son of *Adam* (personally or individually), but "the Son of *man*" (generically.) He chooses to be known as the Son of the *race*, because not merely by office, but through His very essential derivation from the life of whole and perfect man and God, He had been constituted the one and only possible Saviour of the race. "For there is none other Name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved," but "the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth;" and here the name includes the person.

The awakening energy of John's baptism was likewise the herald of the coming fulfilment of the promise: "Behold, I make all things new," was the second great moving of the Spirit on the waste of waters, preparatory to the creation of "the new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." It was meant to rouse into activity that dormant and "very good" life of man, while his moral character was yet in harmony with his Maker, and which, having been poisoned by Adam's sin, is dulled and deadened, and bound, without this help from God, to sink finally into the sleep of everlasting death. The revival and renewal of the first purely natural creation, innocent, but put under ban for man's transgression (lest he should sink below it), properly begins with him, its lord. He must first be roused from the stupor of death before the non-self-conscious creation can be restored, and to this end must be sprinkled with the reviving water of baptism. Hence the call of the Spirit that accompanies John's baptism is: "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light."

John in his own person, independent of his doctrine, was the herald of this restoration, and therefore the great respect paid him by Christ. Born in his parents' old age, he is called by the evangelist "a man sent from God," and coming, thus sent, at the close of the promise to Abraham, as Isaac at the beginning, was like him, typical of the miraculous birth of Jesus,

though only typical. The Baptist draws the line broadly when he says of the Messiah that He "came from above," and "came from heaven," in being (unlike Isaac and himself), conceived and born of but one parent, a Virgin, and that—by the power of the Holy Ghost—solely of her own human life, as God made it for man in the beginning, both a creative and generative life. Being filled from his birth with the Spirit of the old dispensation, he was a man of extraordinary force of character, and drew to him "Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan," and preached vehemently, like Elijah of old, and suffered martyrdom for fearlessly denouncing sin. But this, in the nature of things, was all he could do. It was not his to lay the axe to the root of the tree. His baptism could bring light, but not life. It could merely show man his lost condition by nature, not give him its remedy. Life was to be a separate epoch in the new creation, as it had been in the old. But it could point (and so far bear witness) to the Source and Giver of life: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." It could proclaim Jesus the Saviour of the world, but not the Father of all them that believe. Ease of conscience it could direct its recipients how to obtain, but not the new birth; the way to become pardoned sinners, but not free men in Christ Jesus. It was for the Messiah by receiving and coupling it with His own, to enrich the baptism of His forerunner and inform it with life.

John was a true Messianic prophet, though his burden was the "sorrow" of the Christ, instead of the glory of the Lord, for which this was to prepare. Doubtless, then, when his lofty spirit which had had the open heaven for its vision, and his lion's voice the desert for its range, succumbed to the narrow walls and close air of Herod's prison, the second Elias did, despondently, send his disciples to Jesus with the inquiry, "Art thou He that should come, or look we for another?" But it was probably more for their sake than his own, for John was

not "a reed shaken by the wind." When they had departed with the answer: "Go your way, and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; how the blind see, the lame walk; the lepers are cleansed, the dead are raised, and to the poor the gospel is preached" (all signs of the Messiah): "and blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me:" Jesus exonerated him in the eyes of the people from any charge of wavering in his peculiar faith. John's prayer was for light, more light! But this the old dispensation could not afford even its herald of the Christ. On the contrary, it culminated, as he foretold, in the extinguishing of that Light; which, after he had departed, rose again to be likewise the Life of the world.

John's mission was clearly defined in his own eyes—"I am come baptizing with water." Hence his title of "the Baptist." And God's object in sending him for this purpose, and the scope of his mission, were just as clearly defined: "That *He* should be made manifest to *Israel*—in person their Messiah and in character a Saviour—for thus Jesus was either to be accepted or rejected by Israel before He could further offer Himself to it and the whole world as the sin-atoning "Son of man." Even John could not be certain that Jesus was the promised Messiah and Saviour, till he had baptized Him with water. How then could the people recognize Him without this same baptism? The Scripture says expressly that "the Pharisees and lawyers who rejected the counsel of God against themselves" (which was to bring them to this knowledge), did so "not being baptized with the baptism of John." This, as it awakens and then illumines, would have revealed to them their lost condition as sinners by nature, and Jesus as a Saviour. But they refused it. The result was that when convinced by the preaching and miracles of Jesus that He was their Messiah, they wilfully closed their eyes and hardened their hearts to the truth. On the other hand, all "the people and the publicans" who accepted John's testimony that Jesus was the Christ and sin-bearing Lamb, did so through the grace obtained by being previously "baptized of him," and were doubtless those same "common people" who afterward "heard Jesus gladly."

SECTION IV.

Why was Jesus Baptized?

When John baptized Jesus he obtained the assurance that He was personally the sinless Messiah, and officially the atoning Lamb of God; and by the succeeding descent of the Spirit on Christ, that He was to "baptize with the Holy Ghost." Hence, when told by his followers that Jesus (by His disciples) "made and baptized more" than he, John yielded gracefully to the Mightier One who, coming after, was preferred before him, and replied, "He must increase, but I must decrease." He became aware in the act of baptizing that he was transferring his office to Jesus and his own work was done.

This much John had learned. But why was Jesus baptized by His forerunner except to be an example of obedience for others? What had He gained by that baptism which He afterward intimated was "from heaven" or ordained of God? For what He too was, in the first place, to learn of Himself personally, and then officially, through this act, is evident, else would not God have required it of Him, nor would Mary at the prompting of the Spirit have hid in her heart His miraculous conception and all the predictions made at His birth. He "increased in wisdom" as well as "stature," and the consciousness that God alone was His Father (by special creation) had been awakened in Him when, at the age of twelve years, He went with His parents up to Jerusalem to the Feast of the Passover. That consciousness, however, had in the providence of God been checked at the time by the remonstrance of His mother, and He returned with them to Nazareth and for eighteen years longer "was subject unto them." Nevertheless it grew and developed strongly by constant communion with God, and was probably increased by Nature's growing recognition of Him as her rightful head and lord. "What manner of man is this that even the wind and the sea obey Him?" But, by John's baptism, which brought the full

awakening, it was wholly confirmed; and henceforth He knew Himself to be indeed the sinless Son of man. "Which of *you* convinceth *me* of sin?" No more than this could be obtained of Himself personally, as man, by the baptism of water; but something could be obtained officially. He could learn what "was in man," so that "He needed not that any should testify of man to Him," and with that full knowledge of the natural evil in the hearts of all men, which this baptism necessarily brought, came also the flood of light which revealed Him to Himself as the destined Lamb of God, who, in being the sinless Son of man, was to take it all away by His death.

But the Messiah's baptism was not completed by John's. He was more than merely the created Son of God. He was also His begotten Son, begotten from all eternity, and since these two made Him but one personality, this Sonship was also to be *immediately* acknowledged, and therefore "Jesus went up *straightway* out of the water; and lo, the heavens were opened unto Him, and He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon Him: and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Personally, this baptism of the Spirit was to strengthen in Christ that consciousness of eternal Divine Sonship, which should henceforth grow stronger and stronger, and for the truth of which He would, in the end, lay down His life. Officially, it was to give Him power to communicate to men His life as it is both created and everlasting, and uncreated and eternal. Hence, some of His many highest utterances—"As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself." For what purpose? To give it to others. "Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him."

To John, a witness, but no partaker of this descent, it was the fulfillment of God's special promise to him: "Upon Whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." The consequence was that he "bare record that this is the Son of

God;" that is, not only the divinely-created, but also the divinely and formally consecrated Messiah, or anointed Son of God; and henceforth John preached Him as such. The result of the vision and the words, "This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased," as they afterward wrought on his mind, are no doubt contained in his strongest utterances: "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."

What, then, did He mean by these expressions? No more than could be applied, at that time, to the Messiah and His work: by "everlasting life," salvation for the soul; and by "hath," even then, in the unfailing *promise* of God. Reproduced by St. John, the words harmonize so well with his own, that they might be mistaken for them, and, uttered by the Baptist, can only be attributed to his prophetic office. He spake by the Spirit, and, like all the prophets of old, spake darkly, "searching diligently what the Spirit of Christ did signify when it testified beforehand of Him." It was to be given to the apostles "to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven," or "Church of Christ," which "many prophets and righteous men desired to see and to hear, but saw and heard them not;" and, if to the Baptist even the first of these mysteries had been revealed, the question would never have been sent: "Art Thou He that should come, or look we for another?" The Evangelist's fuller knowledge, attained later, may be added to the forerunner's, but not considered his who was ignorant by the force of circumstances. The depth of meaning that was in those words for the apostle, when he recorded them half a century after Christ, was not there for the prophet who spake them before Jesus began to call disciples. For doubtless St. John is recalling them as he heard them at that time, while he was still a disciple of the Baptist, and before the Messiah bade him follow Him.

XI.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

LITERATURE AND POETRY. Studies on the English Language; The Poetry of the Bible; The Dies Irae; The Stabat Mater; The Hymns of St. Bernard; The University, Ancient and Modern; Dante Alighieri; The Divina Commedia. By Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1890. Price, \$3.00.

Of living authors few are more readable and instructive than Dr. Philip Schaff, the learned and distinguished church historian. His power of always perceiving the really important points of a subject and of presenting them to his readers in a perfectly intelligible manner, is truly remarkable. In this respect, indeed, he has very few, if any, superiors. Hence his works are invariably possessed of unusual and decided merit. The present volume, which is his latest, like all those that have preceded it, gives evidence of this. The studies, or essays, of which it is made up, are all written in a clear and attractive style, and are replete with desirable and valuable information. On the subjects of which they treat, it would be very difficult to find anything more satisfactory within the same compass. These subjects, moreover, are without exception of an interesting character and such as every intelligent person should have some knowledge of. The volume accordingly will be a valuable addition to any library, and it is especially suited to meet the wants of the general reader.

THE NATURE AND METHOD OF REVELATION. By George Park Fisher, D.D., LL.D., Titus Street Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1890. Price, \$1.25.

This volume is an important contribution to theological literature. It contains two parts. Only the first part, which is divided into four chapters, has to do directly with the Nature and Method of Revelation. The titles of the different chapters are, "Revelation and the Bible," "The Gradualness of Revelation," "The Differentiation of Christianity from Judaism," and "Revelation and Faith." These chapters appeared as articles in *The Century Magazine* during the past winter, but are now given to the public in a revised and somewhat enlarged form, which the author hopes will contribute to the better elucidation of the subject. The second part

consists of five supplementary essays on important topics in New Testament criticism, which are briefly touched upon in the preceding chapters. These essays treat of "The Authorship and Date of the Gospels," "The Character of the Gospel Histories," "The New Testament Writings on the Time of the Second Advent," and "Professor Huxley's Comments on the Gospel Narratives."

All the questions discussed in the volume are treated in a scholarly and masterly manner. Dr. Fisher holds that notwithstanding the critical investigations that have now been carried on for several centuries with reference to the Bible, "the Scriptures remain, and must continue to be, the Christian's guide in matters of faith and duty, the normative exposition of Christian doctrine." At the same time he also holds that "All the ascertained results of this fruitful period of Biblical investigation must be frankly recognized," and that "in the end Christian evidences will be seen to be the stronger by this allegiance to truth and loyalty to conscience." The book will prove serviceable to all who would secure for themselves a proper position for rightly viewing and understanding the Bible and for repelling the attacks of unbelievers against its inspired teachings. It consequently is a work which meets a real want and which deserves a wide circulation and a careful reading.

PERSONAL CREEDS, or How to Form a Working Theory of Life. By Newman Smyth. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1890. Price, \$1.00.

This book is made up of eight discourses which the author states in his brief preface "grew together from one idea," and are published in their present form "with the hope that they may reach those men, of whom there are many in these times, who cannot believe everything that they have been taught, but who would not miss the best faiths which are implied in man's truest life." The subjects of these discourses are the following: "Moral Beginnings," "In Personal Touch with Christ," "Nearer Ends of Heavenly Truths," "God in Our Lives," "Human Forgiveness a Measure for the Divine," "Jesus' Argument for Immortality," "Practical Views of Future Retribution," and "Points of Contact Between this Life and the Next."

The aim of the book is to point out how a man may attain to a true faith, which shall be his real, personal creed and his working theory of life. "There is no solid genuineness in character," Dr. Smyth very forcibly maintains, "until one has found a point of crystallization for his life around something which he believes, and which he knows it would be personal disintegration for him to give up. This is the last difference between those men who are worth something as men in the world and those who are worthless. The former have taken firm root somewhere in the moral law, and have held on by that faith; the latter have taken root nowhere, and

hence have no true life in them." Throughout the book is highly instructive and eloquent. It cannot be read by any one without benefit. We commend it to ministers of the gospel generally as a model of truly practical preaching.

JUDGES AND RUTH. By the Rev. Robert A. Watson, M.A., Author of "Gospels of Yesterday." New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. 1890. Price, \$1.50.

This volume belongs to the series now being published under the general title of "The Expositor's Bible." The books of Scripture on which its expositions are based are, in a homiletical point of view, among the most interesting in the sacred canon, owing to the varied and striking historical incidents in which they abound. The expositions themselves are sound and instructive. For while their style is not brilliant, it is yet clear and forcible; and while their author does not consider in them the critical questions raised by modern Biblical investigation, he yet shows himself possessed of a thorough knowledge of Scripture truth. Though the book is not equal in merit to some of the earlier volumes of the series, it is nevertheless worthy a place alongside of them, and cannot fail to be serviceable to those who would acquaint themselves more fully with the teachings of God's holy Word.

THE PROPHECIES OF JEREMIAH. With a Sketch of His Life and Times. By the Rev. C. J. Ball, M.A., Chaplain of Lincoln Inn, Contributor to Bishop Elliott's "Commentary," "The Speaker's Commentary," etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. 1890. Price, \$1.50.

This volume also forms part of "The Expositor's Bible," and it will be found one of the most valuable of the series. The preliminary sketch of the life and times of the prophet is highly interesting and admirably designed to throw light on his inspired utterances. The exposition of his prophecies is clear and scholarly, and the practical application of them to our own times in some cases is very pungent. As examples, we give the following: "Men still make a toil of perverting their way, and spend as much pains in becoming accomplished villains as honest folks take to excel in virtue. Deceit is still the social atmosphere and environment, and through deceit men refuse to know Javah. The knowledge, the recognition, the steady recollection of what Javah is, and what His law requires, does not suit the man of lies; his objects oblige him to shut his eyes to the truth. Men *do not will* and *will not* to know the moral impediments that lie in the way of self-seeking and self-pleasing." "A Christian country? Why? Is it because we can boast of some two hundred forms or fashions of supposed Christian belief, differentiated from each other by Heaven knows what obscure Shibboleths, which in the lapses of time have become meaningless and obsolete; while the old ill-will survives, and the old

dividing lines remain, and Christians stand apart from Christians in a state of dissension and disunion that does despise and dishonor to Christ, and must be very dear to the devil!" "There is a worse than heathenish besottedness in the heart that can pamper a dog, and be utterly indifferent to the helplessness and the sufferings of the children of the poor." "Paper constitutions have never yet redeemed a nation from its vices, nor delivered a community from the impotence and the decay which are the inevitable fruits of moral corruption. Arbitrary legislative changes will not alter the inward condition of a people; covetousness and hypocrisy, pride and selfishness, intemperance and uncleanness and cruelty, may be as rampant in a commonwealth as in a kingdom."

We commend the work to all our readers as well worthy their attention. It will not only be found a valuable help in the studying of the prophecies which it seeks to explain, but also a rich treasury of choice thoughts forcibly expressed.